

laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1450. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on a list of papers, No. D42-257, recommended to him for disposition by the Department of War, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 446. Resolution requesting certain information from the Secretary of State (Rept. No. 1851). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H. R. 6716. A bill to change the name of the Table Rock Dam to the John T. Woodruff Dam; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6717. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through service with the allied forces of the United States during the first or second World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6718. A bill to expedite the naturalization of persons who are not citizens, who have served or who hereafter serve honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 6719. A bill to provide that during the existing emergency deductions shall not be made from insurance benefits payable to any person under title 11 of the Social Security Act by reason of such person rendering service for wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6720. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution to create a commission to be known as the Alaska Road Commission; to the Committee on Roads.

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to create a commission to be known as the Panama Road Commission; to the Committee on Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 6721. A bill for the relief of Mildred G. Gordon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 6722. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2512. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the City Council of Revere, Mass., opposing proposed tax on State and municipal bond issues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2513. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of Dr. Stephen Pencheff, of Indianapolis, Ind., in behalf of drugless physicians; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2514. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Fresno County Chamber of Commerce, in relation to the Japanese and alien enemy situation on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2515. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolution of representatives of 31 of the 43 Michigan colleges and universities in which National Youth Administration college work programs are sponsored, urging that the National Youth Administration student work program be continued, etc.; to the committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost satisfy our understanding, our conscience, and our hearts, in Thy holy name we pray. Thy canon of life, of idealism, and of hope is inspired from the very center of the highest realm. Dear Lord God, while the world gives its peace to reward toil and to exhausted energy, Thou givest peace to prepare and to arouse us from repose, to make the yoke easy and the burden light. Oh, let Thy spirit move on the face of the waters for when fast falls the evening tide, when the darkness deepens, then will the gods of war flee away.

Almighty God, these are the days of high tides; the surf is heavy, the toll is great, the storm is wild and fierce, and at times we are mocked by the vanishing vision of the rainbow. O Lord, let us feel the pressure of Thy hand as we hail Thy voice as the breath of the Almighty, calling for judgment and dominion over the destitution of earth, and prevailing over the wretchedness of man. Heavenly Father, when fears are all torn away and our souls beat a path through the tides, we shall stand gazing and rejoicing in speechless wonder before Him who adds forgiveness amid the desolate wastes of human life. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, yesterday noon when the House convened I was having lunch in the House restaurant with Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville project, and discussing with him pending legislation relating thereto. If I had been present on the floor of the House, I would certainly have also expressed my tribute

to our distinguished colleague from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD.

I have served as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors during the past 9 years, while Judge MANSFIELD has been committee chairman. He is one of the most kindly, courteous, considerate, patient, and fair-minded men I have ever met. Judge MANSFIELD possesses a knowledge of our waterways and rivers and harbors, which is probably not equaled by any other person in the Nation. Furthermore, as I have pointed out on previous occasions in past years, there is no class or type of Federal projects which are subjected to such thorough and far-reaching scrutiny, study, and investigation as river and harbor projects. Of all Government projects, they should be the last and deserve the least to be stigmatized as "pork." The personal attack on Judge MANSFIELD is simply another demonstration of the ignorance and viciousness of a venal press. Judge MANSFIELD is a great and good American, loved and revered by all who have the privilege of knowing him, and I am proud to count him as my friend.

[Here the gavel fell.]

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

There appeared in the Washington Star and other newspapers of the country a statement by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative THOMAS H. ELIOT, and I will read the statement:

Representative THOMAS H. ELIOT, of Massachusetts, hurled a direct lie charge at Congressman MARTIN DIES, Democrat, of Texas, today, asserting that the Texan had not been asked by the administration to withhold his report on Japanese fifth-column activities, but had, on the contrary, twice been asked to give information and had twice refused. "When Mr. DIES says in his report issued yesterday that he wanted to make it public last September and that the administration prevented him, I issue the direct lie charge," ELIOT declared in a bristling speech to the Massachusetts State Congress of Industrial Organizations convention. "I have received a letter from Attorney General Biddle saying there was never any attempt or suggestion that the Dies committee was not permitted to report the facts last September."

Mr. Speaker, the definition of "lie" is the uttering of a falsehood, knowing it to be a falsehood, for the intention of deceiving. I submit that is ground for personal privilege, and I ask recognition to answer it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan and Mr. STARNES of Alabama rose.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Arnold	Baumhart	Blackney
Barnes	Beam	Bolton
Bates, Mass.	Bender	Buckley, N. Y.

Byron	Jarrett	Rivers
Cartwright	Jensen	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Johnson,	Sacks
Cole, Md.	Lyndon B.	Sasscer
Copeland	Kleberg	Scanlon
Creal	Kramer	Schaefer, Ill.
Curtis	Lesinski	Shannon
Ditter	McKeough	Sheridan
Englebright	McLaughlin	Smith, Pa.
Fish	McMillan	Sweeney
Fitzpatrick	Maas	Tolan
Flaherty	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Gearhart	Mansfield	Vreeland
Gifford	Mott	Walter
Halleck	Mundt	West
Hancock	Nichols	White
Heffernan	O'Day	Worley
Houston	Osmer	Wright
Izac	Ploeser	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who were not here when I rose to a question of personal privilege, I wish to again read a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Star and in the press of the country dated February 28:

Representative THOMAS H. ELIOT, of Massachusetts, hurled a direct lie charge at Congressman MARTIN DIES, Democrat, of Texas, today, asserting that the Texan had not been asked by the administration to withhold his report on Japanese fifth-column activities, but had, on the contrary, twice been asked to give information and had twice refused.

"When Mr. DIES says in his report issued yesterday that he wanted to make it public last September and that the administration prevented him, I issue a direct lie charge," Eliot declared in bristling speech to the Massachusetts State Congress of Industrial Organizations convention. "I have received a letter from Attorney General Biddle saying there was never any attempt or suggestion that the Dies committee was not permitted to reveal the facts last September."

The gentleman from Massachusetts came to me a few moments ago and denies he used the word "lie." Does the gentleman want to make a statement as to that for the benefit of the House?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Yes; I thank the gentleman from Texas. I read a short statement, because I did not want to be misquoted. I did certainly say that the Attorney General had written to me saying there was never any attempt or suggestion that the Dies committee be not permitted to reveal the facts last September. I did not use the word "lie."

Mr. DIES. Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to give the House of Representatives all the facts in connection with this matter, not because of the attack that has been made upon me, and the repeated attacks, because every year for 4 years we have had the same character of opposition from the same source. Most of the arguments that are advanced this year against the continuation of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities have been advanced every year when the question came before the House.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. What was the group or the meeting that the

Representative from Massachusetts addressed?

Mr. DIES. Massachusetts State C. I. O. convention.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Is that the same convention that during the past week or this week, by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to free the draft dodger, Earle Browder, who served a sentence in jail in the last World War for refusing to serve in the Army or for impeding the draft?

Mr. DIES. Yes; I have been so advised by the press, that is true.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Was that the same convention at which the speaker preceding me was the Republican Governor of Massachusetts, Leverett Saltonstall, and where one of the other scheduled speakers was a member of the Dies committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY]?

Mr. DIES. I am not familiar with those facts, but if the gentleman says they are correct, they are.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in raising the point of personal privilege is more in defense of the dignity of the House of Representatives than in my own personal defense, because I have an abiding faith that if the confidence of the American people in the legislative body is undermined by slander and misrepresentation, by untruthful statements that appear in the press from time to time, it will be a great blow to the cause of democracy, and the preservation of our form of government. To say the least, it is unfortunate when any Member of the House sees fit to resort to language of this character in attacking another Member of the House. I have served in this body for 11 years. During that time I have come in contact intimately with most of the Members of this body. I have learned that there are no more patriotic men in America than the Representatives in the Congress, from the Speaker, the floor leader, to all of the Members on both sides of the aisle. I think I can say, after a service of 11 years, that there is no body in America composed of more patriotic men and women than this body. I have had occasion to differ with gentlemen in this House on political matters, but because I differed with them, and because they differed with me, would not justify me in impugning their motives, or warrant me to give expression to thoughts or views that would bring in question their honesty and their patriotism.

On August 18, 1941, I received a letter from the Attorney General of the United States. It will be recalled that in July, beginning the 5th of July, I issued a number of press releases warning the people about the Japanese situation. You will find some of these press releases in a report which was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Un-American Activities, dealing with Japanese espionage activities in this country, and in these press releases I told the American people that there was a Japanese fifth column in this country, that it constituted a serious menace to our Nation, and that every effort should be made to expose that fifth column.

I received this letter from the Attorney General. It is dated August 13, 1941:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1941.

Hon. MARTIN DIES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to call your attention to certain statements which have appeared in the press to the effect that an elaborate sabotage plot was uncovered by agents of your Special Committee on Un-American Activities on the west coast. According to press statements, evidence of an elaborate sabotage plot, under the direction of Japanese agents and naval officers, was uncovered by investigators of your committee.

According to the press reports, your committee agents, over the last 3 months, had conducted an "on the scene investigation" and the evidence which they had developed has been turned over to the Department of Justice. The press report further relates, "The Texas Representative said much of the evidence on which his charges were based had come from a former attaché of the Japanese consulate in Hawaii who attended secret meetings of the sabotage ring at Terminal Island, off Los Angeles, home of some 5,000 Japanese and site of a vast United States gasoline depot. The evidence has been turned over to the Justice Department for prosecution of the ring's members; but, unless the Department acts promptly, I will order public hearings so the American people can get the facts."

The records of this Department fail to disclose the receipt of any such evidence as described by you. The only information which has been received by this Department or any bureau thereof was a letter from Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator for your committee, under date of July 29, 1941, transmitting a telegram which had been received from Messrs. Dunstan and Steedman, of your Los Angeles office. The telegram stated, in substance, that Japanese ships off the California coast were to be the object of sabotage carried out by Italian agents, the purpose being to precipitate hostilities between the United States and Japan. This apparently is not the matter referred to in the press releases, since it alleged that the investigators of the plot were Italians and the press statement indicates "evidence of an elaborate sabotage plot on the west coast developed under the direction of Japanese agents and naval officers."

I, of course, do not know if you have been correctly quoted in the press; however, I would like to ask that you immediately make available to this Department any and all information and evidence in your possession concerning the allegations, so that I may initiate appropriate action.

I shall greatly appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

That letter was received at my Washington office while I was in Texas, where it was forwarded to me. I answered it, and I read the exact language of the letter I sent to Attorney General Biddle.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I wonder what is the date of the gentleman's reply to the letter of the Attorney General which is dated August 13.

Mr. DIES. That is what I am getting at. It is dated August 27, 1941. The letter is addressed to Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. BIDDLE: Your letter of August 13 addressed to me in Washington has been forwarded to me for attention. I did not say that I had turned the information over to your Department, or that I intended to do so.

What I said was that I wanted to give your Department full opportunity to proceed, without being embarrassed by any premature disclosure.

I assume that with the hundreds of agents which you have you would have no difficulties in getting the facts. I am sure that you will find our investigators on the west coast cooperative in every respect in supplying you with leads and with facts in our possession. I note that Mr. Hoover recently stated that through publicity his department had thwarted a Nation-wide plot to sabotage the defense industries of America. Since he was able to do this through this method of publicity, it would appear to me there would be no possible objection to a similar procedure by our committee in the Japanese matter. If therefore you have no objection I shall suggest to our committee the advisability of conducting public hearings to receive evidence regarding Japanese activities in the United States. If your department has no objection to this procedure please advise me.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman why, in view of his denial in the letter that he has just read, he would turn over information to the F. B. I., why on page 1731 of his recently published report he includes a news story from the Los Angeles Times saying, "All evidence has been turned over to the Justice Department for the purpose of prosecuting?"

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is quoting from a newspaper report that appeared in the Los Angeles Times. Is that right?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I was wondering why the gentleman included that in his report.

Mr. DIES. What date?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. August 1, 1941.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts has just denied a statement that appeared in a newspaper several days ago, although he did not refute it until the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies] called it to the attention of the House today.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I am not saying that the gentleman from Texas was not perfectly accurate in claiming that he had been misquoted. I am asking him why, in view of the fact that he was misquoted, he included that letter in this report?

Mr. DIES. I am going to answer the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Massachusetts started this fight by going out and attacking the Dies committee. Now he should take his medicine.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, on September 8, 1941, I received this letter from the Acting Attorney General, Mr. McGuire:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1941.

HON. MARTIN DIES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In your letter of August 27, 1941, addressed to the Attorney General, you stated that if the Attorney General had no objection you would suggest to your committee the advisability of conducting public hearings to receive evidence regarding Japanese activities in the United States.

The Attorney General has discussed this situation with the President and the Secre-

tary of State, both of whom feel quite strongly that hearings such as you contemplate would be inadvisable. The Attorney General is of the same opinion, and accordingly is unable to approve the course which you have in mind.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW F. MCGUIRE,
Acting Attorney General,
of the United States.

Immediately after I had written to Mr. Biddle assuring him that our investigators on the west coast would be glad to cooperate in every possible way and furnish his investigators or representatives with all of the leads and facts in our possession, I instructed our investigators to cooperate in every possible way with the F. B. I., the Military Intelligence, and the Naval Intelligence. As a matter of fact, our investigators have informed me, and they are now sending a telegram setting forth the facts, that they did cooperate with the Military and Naval Intelligence; that, as a matter of fact, they had several conferences about this matter with the man in charge of the Naval Intelligence on the west coast and with the Military Intelligence. Also, they came in contact with the F. B. I. in connection with this matter and telephoned to the west coast chief in charge of the F. B. I.

After the Attorney General of the United States had represented to me that the President and the Secretary of State and the Attorney General were strongly opposed to the hearings, our committee felt that it was inadvisable for us to proceed. In deference to their wishes we canceled the proposed hearings.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman give us the date of that letter?

Mr. DIES. The date of the last letter from the Attorney General is September 8, 1941.

We had arranged to subpoena and bring to Washington approximately 52 witnesses. Among those witnesses was a former attaché of the Japanese consulate in Honolulu. Their testimony would comprise the major part of the evidence which our committee had assembled. Those witnesses, of course, were on the west coast. Much of our evidence was on the west coast. Our investigators on the west coast were familiar with all of the facts, more than we were, of course, in Washington. Therefore, in saying to the Attorney General that our investigators would be glad to cooperate with him in every possible way and supply them with all leads and facts, the committee could do no more. Our investigators had offices in the Federal building in the city of Los Angeles. All that was necessary was for agents of any department to avail themselves of the information, which we had assembled.

May I say in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that we have 1,140 letters, or approximately that, from heads of various agencies and departments of government requesting information which our committee has furnished in every instance. Many agencies of the Government have assigned agents to work in our offices. They have access to our files, to all of the information and records which

we have. Attorney General Biddle, in a statement before one of the committees of this House recently, stated—and I read the language of his statement:

I would like to add, Mr. Congressman, that the Dies committee has been most cooperative. That they gave us everything that they had. Their position has been most cooperative.

Now, this was the statement of the Attorney General only a week or so ago, and he is speaking about the Dies committee.

They gave us everything that they had. Their position has been most cooperative. As far as I am concerned, I will say that they do cooperate and give us every possible piece of information that we desire.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Let me proceed.

I have also a letter from Secretary Knox, who acted very promptly on the suggestion of our committee and I shall read that for the sake of the record. It is dated February 21, 1942, and is addressed to the Honorable Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that an individual by the name of George Deatherage is now employed on a construction project at the Norfolk, Va., naval base.

This is to advise you that this man was thoroughly investigated by this committee in 1938 and 1939 and that he was called before our committee and questioned concerning his Nazi and Fascist activities.

The committee has in its possession a large file on Deatherage and his activities which we will be glad to make available to your Department should you desire it.

I received this letter from Secretary Knox:

MY DEAR MR. DIES: This will acknowledge your letter of February 21, 1942, relative to the employment of George E. Deatherage by Doyle and Russell, contractors working on the naval operating base in Norfolk, Va.

Immediately upon receiving the information that Deatherage was employed by the firm on the naval operating base project I caused a thorough investigation to be made and on February 23 invoked provisions of the contract which requires that the contractor shall discharge from the employment and exclude from the site of the work any person designated by the Secretary of the Navy as undesirable to have access to the work and/or materials of the Navy Department.

Thank you for your cooperative offer to make available the files of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

The committee has cooperated with the Department in this and many other similar matters.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. In just a few minutes, if the gentleman will let me proceed.

I may say that from the beginning, Mr. Speaker, we have received the fullest cooperation from the State Department. One of the very valuable agents from the State Department has been most helpful to our committee in supplying us with important information, and after I had received from the Acting Attorney General the letter in which he stated that the administration was opposed to these hearings, then I had a personal conversation with the Secretary of State, Mr.

Cordell Hull, one of the greatest men, in my opinion, that this country has ever produced. I shall not say what was in that conversation, for I am not at liberty to make public the facts, but I will say this, and I believe that Mr. Hull will bear me out, that I said to him after we had decided to call off the hearings, that we wanted to cooperate with the State Department because we realized that they were charged with the conduct of international affairs. I told him that the situation was indeed grave, that we had evidence in our possession that indicated very strongly to me that the Japanese were engaged in fifth-column activities, and that they were doing things that our Government should take cognizance of and take steps to prevent.

Mr. Hull then said to me, "I am interested in the matter." And I said to him: "All of the files of our office are available to you and to any department of this Government."

We are cooperating day in and day out with the departments, and a major part of our work today is in supplying Government agencies with the information which they do not have and which they could not have and cannot obtain from any other source. It would seem to me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence is very clear that what I said on the floor of this House is borne out by the facts and that the committee has cooperated in every respect with all of the agencies of the Government. We are striving to maintain harmony with these agencies because as I wired the President in 1940, it is absolutely essential that the various agencies of the Government engaged in ferreting out fifth-column activities must cooperate and that there is no place for rivalry, for jealousy, or for a lack of co-ordination in the conduct of this work. I am not here to criticize the Department of Justice or the Secretary of State. The purpose of including this letter in our report was not to cast reflection upon those agencies.

Those agencies are now fully cooperating with our committee. I have just read a statement issued or purporting to have been issued by the Attorney General with reference to investigation of people on the Government pay roll who are undesirable. I do not want to misquote the Attorney General and I rely entirely on press reports, but, according to that statement, the Attorney General admits that previous efforts to investigate these people have been insufficient and that an entirely new investigation has been ordered, and this time they are going to get the facts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. If the gentleman is so cooperative with the Department of Justice and the State Department, why has he on at least two occasions on the floor of this House given us and the American people to understand that but for the interference of those Departments with his committee, Pearl Harbor might not have happened?

Mr. DIES. Let me answer that directly. Here is the exact language I

used, and I quote from my speech made on the floor of this House. I tell the story of how we intended to hold the hearings and that we received a letter from the Attorney General advising us not to do it, or, rather, saying that they were strongly opposed to it, and I state further:

I now regret that I called off the hearings.

I do regret that, because I remember when we made public the so-called white paper—a document of some 500 pages of a most complete exposé of Nazi activities that this or any other country has ever made public—so thorough was the job that, upon the basis of the evidence which we had assembled and made public, the Department of Justice prosecuted all of the malefactors and put them in the penitentiary or deported them. Their agents who had worked in contact with the committee staff stated to us that it was upon the basis of this evidence that convictions were secured against these people. Having made public this information, which was widely published in all the democracies, we had requests from the British Government, from the agencies of other democracies—Canada and others—for that committee report. It was carried in all the press of every democratic country. It has been used for propaganda or information purposes over the radio and in all the countries in opposition to the Axis Powers. As a matter of fact, only a week or so ago Colonel Donovan requested several hundred documents from our committee—documents I presume he could not procure from any other source. We immediately responded to his request and furnished him with this information, which, of course, he proposes to use against the Axis Powers throughout the world.

May I mention, too, that the gentleman from Massachusetts and certain other gentlemen have been critical of this committee, and I concede the right of the gentleman to do that. I have never contended we were perfect. We have only had \$385,000 in a period of 4 years, and I am not complaining about that because I think this House deserves a great deal of credit for its loyal support of this committee. It is evidence of the fact that long before fifth-columnist activities became serious the House of Representatives with foresight and wisdom foresaw and made provision. This committee is merely the agent of the House. The gentleman is perfectly within his rights to point out errors and mistakes, because we have made them. My objection to the gentleman and his attitude is that it is not constructive criticism. If the gentleman would come to me and say, "Now, Mr. DIES, I think you made a mistake; what are the facts?" and we sit down across the table as colleagues in the same body, as men equally patriotic, as men who are trying to serve a great country at a moment of great crisis, if the gentleman is correct, I will gladly admit that fact, for I do not occupy the position that has been taken by some of these bureaus. I am not personally offended when mistakes are pointed out. I think

it is a good thing for this committee, and it would be a good thing for every agency of government if they were compelled to appear before this House and defend their conduct in every particular. We would have less evidence of arrogance and of red tape than we do in respect to certain departments.

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGRANERY. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's statement. As I understand him and his correspondence with the Attorney General, he has informed the Attorney General that he had certain evidence, that if the Attorney General would communicate with his agent or agents or the committee on the west coast, they could give him, the Attorney General, leads?

Mr. DIES. And facts; all the facts in our possession.

Mr. McGRANERY. The basis for this entire contention here this morning is that the gentleman went a little bit beyond that. In his report he states firmly and clearly that the evidence has been turned over to the Justice Department for prosecution of the ring members. That statement is in error, is it not?

Mr. DIES. I immediately denied that statement to the Attorney General.

Mr. McGRANERY. Then the whole contention is out. There is no argument on that this morning?

Mr. DIES. I immediately wrote him back and said that I had not made that statement. How could we transport 52 witnesses from the west coast and deliver them in the offices of the Attorney General? We had our investigators on the west coast. The Department of Justice had their agents out there, hundreds of them.

Mr. McGRANERY. Why did the gentleman put that in his report in February?

Mr. DIES. Because of the other matter in the report, because of the press clippings, to show one thing and one thing only. We were warning the country in July, August, and September that the Japanese had a fifth column and that the situation was very serious.

Mr. McGRANERY. The gentleman withdraws that statement from the Attorney General. Then it is a case of shadow boxing this morning.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I do not think it is the gentleman from Texas who is doing the shadow boxing.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas this question: In the report just issued by the Dies committee there is a plan published or outlined years ago by the Japanese Empire for invading the west coast of the United States, is there not?

Mr. DIES. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And it maps out the very program that Japan has followed up to date. Is that correct?

Mr. DIES. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Then if the Dies committee had been permitted to go ahead and make this investigation

prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, is it not entirely probable that it would have uncovered these facts and prevented the Pearl Harbor disaster?

Mr. DIES. May I answer that by quoting from the speech I made to the House:

I now regret that I called off the hearings.

As I said, the reason I regretted that was that when we had obtained all the evidence of the German Library of Information and the German Railway Information Office, all the evidence of Manfred Zapp, of the Transocean News Service—and it was a smokescreen for Nazi espionage and propaganda not only in the United States but throughout South America—when we obtained the evidence about the German chemical corporations in this country that led to the freezing of funds and to the suspension of certain heads of those organizations, then the President of the United States in a telegram to me indicated the fear of premature disclosure; so that while we did make public that information, it subsequently developed that it was wise for the country that we did, because it was upon the basis of that information that the Italian and German consuls were expelled from the United States.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Let me finish.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The gentleman has been very kind in yielding.

Mr. DIES. Let me finish my thought.

Mr. Speaker, again on this question that has been raised about whether the special Committee on Un-American Activities—

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Has it been developed that the gentleman from Massachusetts denied to the newspapers that he made that statement? On as important a statement as that you would think that he would have made a statement to the newspapers denying it and asking them to retract. Will the gentleman ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he did that?

Mr. DIES. I may say that this statement was made last Saturday, was it not?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Last Saturday.

Mr. DIES. It appeared in the press, so it speaks for itself.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. But it never has been denied.

Mr. DIES. I am not going to impugn the motives of the gentleman and I am not going to try to interpret his motives. I am willing to treat the gentleman as I have always tried to treat every gentleman of this House. There are on our committee gentlemen who have not agreed with me on economic questions, men like the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis], one of the most sincere Members of this House. We have differed with respect to matters, but we have signed every report unanimously. The reports were signed by every member of the committee. They were signed by the gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. CASEY], the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

When you say that we have sought to smear the C. I. O., that the committee has been the instrumentality of labor-baiting elements for the purpose of smearing the C. I. O., why not let us give the House the true facts?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Let me finish my thoughts, or they will fly away from me.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I did not say that.

Mr. DIES. The true facts with reference to that are that before there ever was an investigation of the C. I. O. I went to the offices of the officials of the C. I. O. in Washington and sat across the table from them and said to them, "Our committee has come into possession of evidence showing that Communists have entrenched themselves in certain labor unions affiliated with the C. I. O." After I had conferred with them, or, rather, during the conference, I asked for their cooperation. I said to them that the committee was not disposed to have public hearings for the purpose of undermining the C. I. O., that all we wanted to do was to expel the Communist leaders from the C. I. O. The officials did not cooperate with our committee. When I got back to my office, I think the files will reveal that in order to make a record of that conference I immediately wrote a letter to Mr. John L. Lewis, who was then the head of the C. I. O., asking for his cooperation in the conduct of our investigation.

Instead of cooperating with us, they began to assail us in the press throughout the country. They issued pamphlets and circulars making the broad, general attack that the committee was inspired by ulterior motives; that we were not primarily concerned with the exposure of Communists in the C. I. O., but that we were seeking to smear labor. All over the country they attacked me as being anti-labor, even though, Mr. ELIOT, the C. I. O. had previously endorsed me until this committee began its work.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? He has addressed me.

Mr. DIES. When we were unable to obtain that cooperation, then it became a matter of duty to this House. I have always construed a House agency or any officer of the House as the agent of the House and not the agent of any other branch of this Government.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I think it is the duty of every agency of this House, including our own, to represent the majority of this House. Here was a nonpartisan question. It had nothing to do with Democrats or Republicans. It dealt solely and exclusively with those fundamental principles upon which all men, of every political affiliation, can agree. Therefore, I believed, as the committee has believed—and may I take this opportunity to express my own and I believe the gratitude of every American who has supported this committee to the other members of

this committee for their loyalty and for their support, for I know it has not been easy for these gentlemen.

I know that these pressure groups have constantly sought in every possible way to attack the committee and to injure, politically, every member of the committee. I think that those gentlemen, all of them, deserve a great deal of credit because they all had the courage and the patriotism to perform their duty to this Congress.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The gentleman has been very kind about yielding and I appreciate it.

Coming back to what the gentleman was saying a few moments ago about his speech of January 28, I wonder, in view of this language, how he can answer the question I am about to put. I quote:

A fear of displeasing foreign powers and a maudlin attitude toward fifth columnists was largely responsible for the unparalleled tragedy at Pearl Harbor.

The gentleman says he is cooperating with the Government departments, and yet he accuses them of a maudlin attitude and so on, and I want to know why and how his committee was prevented from making the facts public last September. He has told us he was urged not to hold a public hearing.

Mr. DIES. I think the answer is very obvious. So far as my statement in that speech is concerned, may I say to the gentleman that those statements did, and do, express my own opinion. However, under all the circumstances, the House of Representatives saw otherwise, and they refused to adopt my amendments. I now believe that the House and Mr. HATTON W. SUMNERS were wiser than I was to this extent: That I believe that while it is absolutely essential for this committee to investigate and expose communism, I agree with the great majority of this House that there is no occasion, regardless of the facts, to risk antagonizing any other foreign country that happens to be allied with us at the present time.

But may I now go back so that, having been refused the cooperation of the leaders of the C. I. O. we attempted with our limited staff and with the small amount of money at our disposal, \$25,000 the first year, to expose the Communist leaders in the C. I. O. If you will read the committee's report you will find today that it was signed by every member of this committee, and that in that report we unanimously found that 10 of the unions affiliated with the C. I. O. had Communists entrenched in positions of leadership.

Now, that was not my own judgment. Personally, I felt that the facts would have justified us in going further. I believed there was sufficient evidence to authorize us to find that a majority of the directors of the C. I. O. were either members of the Communist Party or had been members of the Communist Party or had followed the Communist Party line. But because of the greater wisdom of my colleagues on that committee I have gone along with them. We have

compromised on essential questions, but we did come out with a report that was unanimous, and if my memory serves me right it was signed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]. No one will accuse the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] of being a labor baiter. No one would even suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] is not an ardent and sincere friend of labor, but on the basis of facts, incontrovertible facts, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], a patriotic Member of this House, did his duty, although it might have occasioned him political disaster by doing so.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. I have been impressed, too, that the gentleman has been very fair in yielding to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT], and I hope if the gentleman rises again, the gentleman from Texas will yield to him so that he may explain why a week has elapsed since all the publicity was given to the alleged facts that he had branded the gentleman from Texas as a liar, and has not explained that or retracted it or apologized for it.

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I think I should say to the gentleman first that no week has elapsed, and in the second place I did not know such thin skins were possessed, and I would like to read—

Mr. DIES. I yield no further than that. When you say "thin skins," let me say to you that statements such as you made, if you made them, calling a Member of this House a liar, is no small matter. If the gentleman serves in this body long enough—I have known the Members of this House many years. My father had his office in that corner over there for a decade during one of the most difficult periods in the history of this Republic, and I have seen press reporters, not a majority, but some of them, deliberately distort the facts and do all in their power to undermine the confidence of the American people in this body. Let me say to the gentleman that whether he serves here a long time or a short time, the first thing is to learn to love and respect the Members of this House.

The statement has been made by our critics—and may I say that all those who appeared in opposition to the committee were for the most part representatives of organizations that we had exposed—and in those statements they have sought to create the impression that the committee has devoted its primary effort to an exposure of communism, and has not exposed nazi-ism and fascism. Let me give you a few facts in connection with that so that I may here and now, and for all time, answer that propaganda that is being very cleverly disseminated against our committee. The facts are that we issued a report called the Red Paper, giving the Communist affiliation of a number of front organizations. What do I mean by "front organizations"? I mean an organization that was dominated or is dominated and controlled by a clique of

Communists who belong to it, who attend all of the meetings, and who take advantage of the fact that people join it who never attend, and who run the thing not for the bona fide purpose for which the organization was formed but in order to spread communism. When we began the exposure of Communist front organizations, many people assailed us for it. I remember that we were criticized quite severely for exposing the American League Against War and Fascism, the International Labor Defense, of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is or was chairman, or occupied some position in it. We were severely criticized for that. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that the witnesses in the American Youth Congress appeared before our committee, and that we were bitterly assailed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] remembers who was there. I was not there at the time. If I recall, I was ill. The gentleman remembers that the wife of the Chief Executive appeared with the witnesses, sincerely and honestly believing in her idealism that this organization was a bona fide organization, and she believed that the Dies committee was the instrumentality of the reactionary forces of this country; and she permitted those witnesses to be her guests at the White House during the time the investigation took place. In justice to Mrs. Roosevelt, she finally discovered the truth, and she publicly admitted that she had been deceived by them. And when Mr. Joseph Lash appeared before our committee in executive session a few weeks ago, what did he say?

This was the same Joseph Lash who with arrogance walked into the committee room with Mrs. Roosevelt during our previous hearing and attempted to ridicule the committee, and read a poem attempting to cast ridicule upon its chairman. What did he admit in executive session—and I think I am privileged to tell this? He admitted that we were right all the time. He admitted that he had sought, he and the others, to ridicule the committee and to prevent us from obtaining the truth. Yet he was the man at that time who was leading some of the so-called liberal forces of this country, and the same group were picketing the White House, denouncing President Roosevelt as a warmonger, and demanding that we not aid England. Mr. Joseph Cadden—we have his picture when he was leading one of the picketing parades in front of the White House, and when the President addressed the American Youth Congress they applauded his speech until he said something about communism, and then they jeered and hissed him, and the same men who were opposing our aid to England, who were opposing the lend-lease—and I voted for that, under which Russia has already received millions of dollars from the United States—the same men who took the Well of this floor and who were speaking on the soap boxes of this country, some of them labor leaders, and I am now compiling the record of some of them, who were so vociferous at that time in denouncing our aid to England as intervention of the United States and provocation to war—those same men, when I

was voting to repeal the neutrality law, when I was voting for the foreign policy of this administration, were opposing that policy, and now they have the audacity to stand before the American people and say that MARTIN DIES is a Fascist sympathizer. What are the facts? The facts are that this committee has heard 129 witnesses on the subject of fascism and nazi-ism, that we have approximately 3,000 printed pages of testimony on fascism and nazi-ism. The facts are that we have issued reports on Nazi activities as large as our reports on Communist activities.

The facts are that our committee has assembled over many months documents and evidence with reference to Fascist activities. We have sent those documents to the Printing Office. They are now being printed and in a few days this committee will give to the American people the result of our investigation over a period of years with reference to Fascist activities.

I do not mean to imply that previously we have not given those facts. In justice to this committee I must say that if it had not been for our investigation, Mr. William Dudley Pelley would not now be in the penitentiary. If the gentleman has any doubt about that, call the prosecuting attorney Mr. Williamson, who prosecuted William Dudley Pelley in the North Carolina courts recently and he will tell the gentleman that he telephoned me two times and said:

Where is your investigator, Mr. Barker? It is absolutely essential that he be here. We cannot obtain a conviction without his testimony.

Mr. Barker had spent many months making an audit of all of the financial affairs of William Dudley Pelley. Our committee exposed him. As a result of that exposure Mr. Pelley was put out of business and is now in the penitentiary, or is preparing to go to the penitentiary.

What are the facts about George Deatherage? He and his Knights of the White Camellia organization were exposed by our committee. We did such a thorough job in that exposé that his organization was compelled to go out of existence. If the gentlemen who are constantly reiterating that propaganda will take occasion to study our hearings and study our reports and acquaint themselves with the facts, I am sure that no honest Member of this House will undertake to tell the House that we have been derelict in our duty in investigating nazi-ism and fascism. We have investigated dozens of Fascist and Nazi organizations in this country. If the gentleman has in mind any organization that he thinks we should have investigated that we did not, I would be glad for him now to tell this House. I pause for him to tell the House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington, an honest critic, but a gentleman with it all.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The gentleman takes all the steam out of a man.

Mr. DIES. Oh, I do not mean to do that. Go right ahead.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I am so fond of the gentleman from Texas that I even hesitate to ask this simple question, but I know the gentleman has a very logical answer to this and I am sure all of us will be enlightened by his reply, because I have had many people inquiring of me, asking why it was that Father Coughlin's organization had not been investigated.

Mr. DIES. The answer to that is that Father Coughlin's organization has been investigated. We have in our files evidence with reference to him and with reference to other characters. Now, do you know what they are complaining about? Let me give you the facts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 53 minutes.

Mr. DIES. I want to give the House the facts. I am ready to answer any questions at any time.

We had a number of letters urging us to bring Father Coughlin to Washington and subject him to questioning. I always suspected that those who were urging that were those who wanted to advertise Father Coughlin. We also had letters demanding that Gerald Winrod, a preacher, should be brought before the committee and be investigated, and other preachers. I took the position, and this committee supported that position—and I think that is evidence that it is a wise position—that whenever this committee brought to Washington any preachers or priests and undertook to examine them publicly and permit them to be held in contempt, which would have been the inevitable result, for if Father Coughlin had appeared before our committee, as shrewd a publicist as he is, and had done what others did, and had said, "I refuse to answer any questions," or demanded to make a speech and we had held him in order, then we would have been compelled to appear before this House and ask you to cite in contempt certain priests and preachers. If we had done that, from all over the country there would have arisen an outcry denouncing us as being against certain religions. What we did do, however, was to obtain all of the evidence that we could possibly secure, and we have that evidence and we are now making preparations to give the American people the evidence; both the evidence we have obtained in the past and evidence which we secured this year.

Let me say to the gentleman that we seek to be fair about this matter. As you will observe in our report, a great deal of this evidence is an attempt to smear personally the President of the United States. I think when you read this report you will find that there has been a well-concerted plan, not to attack the President's policies, for that is the right of every citizen. In fact, I am one of those who believes that the greatest service that can be rendered to the President is to give him the benefit of honest, constructive criticism. If the House is not to do that, then why not just all quit and go home? I mean if we are not permitted, in a spirit of honesty and fair dealing and common love of our country, to stand on the floor and, with respect and dignity, urge that certain things are wrong in the executive de-

partment, then the House of Representatives has lost its dignity and its great independence. But this is a type of evidence, consisting of Axis propaganda, directed at the person of the President, propaganda that has been distributed, millions of pieces all over the country, designed to undermine the confidence of the people in the personal integrity of the Chief Executive, knowing that if that is accomplished, the Axis Powers will then be in a position to divide us from within. I say that because I want the gentleman to know, and I believe the gentleman is fair—I believe every Member of this House is fair. I believe if you will go over our records in our office, you will come to the same conclusion that many agencies of this Government have come to.

That is that this committee has performed a wonderful service, because we have been able to seize records and to compel people to testify, while other agencies of the Government have been unable to do that.

I cannot reveal the name of the man or the men, or exactly what they said, but I am sure they would not object. I spoke to some men very high in this Government on the question of the continuation of the Committee on un-American Activities, and I said to them frankly, as I said to the Rules Committee, that it is no personal favor to any member of this committee to continue it. There is no more difficult task assigned to any Member of Congress than to deal with this explosive subject. No committee—and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] can bear me out, for he was chairman of the committee which preceded our committee—he will tell this House that it is one thing to get up and criticize a committee or to say it ought to do this or it ought to do that, but when you are charged with responsibility at a time of great crisis in a Nation's history, then you find it not always easy to do these things that your critics tell you to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I may say that I subscribe to that statement completely. It is a most difficult task to be the chairman of an investigating committee, such as the committee presided over by the gentleman from Texas. Having had experience along that line, I say that we have got to be very tolerant in our criticism.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying that I hope we will permit this to be an example on the floor of this House. All of us are facing a very difficult period, Republicans and Democrats alike. Never before in the history of America was there more need for sincerity, honesty, and zeal in the discharge of public duty than today. America is face to face with a mechanized barbarism that threatens our security and our very existence. If ever there was a time when representatives of the people should demonstrate an attitude of patri-

otism, of fairness, of courtesy, it is today. Whatever may come, whatever the provocation may be, let each of us have a spirit of tolerance and good will toward all the rest of us.

And to the press of the country, may I say to you—and I have dealt with the press rather extensively in the past 4 years—many of you have been very fair to our committee, some of you have been unfair to our committee. You have carried statements that were utterly false. Let me say to you gentlemen that serving in Congress is not as easy as you think it is. Service in Congress during this difficult period when you are besieged by all kinds of problems, when there are those calling upon you daily and hourly for this and for that service, requires all of the patience and all of the courage and all of the patriotism that any of us have; and as we approach that difficult time let it be as friends. Even though—even though—we disagree one with another let us be patient and tolerant and let us continue to be friends fighting in a common cause for the greatest Republic that ever existed in all the annals of history. [Here the gavel fell.]

LT. EDWARD H. O'HARE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I read from this morning's Washington Post and quote Mrs. Selma O'Hare, the mother of Lt. Edward H. O'Hare, a Navy pilot.

The account says this boy shot down six Japanese planes in an air battle over the Pacific Ocean. Mrs. O'Hare said:

I'm all elated.

I understand that two of them got away. He should have got those, too.

How glad I am to hear this. I wrote him last week to "Keep 'em flying," and said we were all behind him. We've got to win this war.

Mrs. O'Hare classed the young man as an average boy. She said he always liked planes and that he told her several times he liked to fly a fighter plane, but that he was never much interested in shooting. She concluded her statement by saying, "But he seems to shoot well enough now."

Mr. Speaker, I know the people of St. Louis are mighty proud of Lieutenant O'Hare. The people of my district are likewise mighty proud of him, and I am doubly proud of him because I had the honor in 1933 to appoint him to the Naval Academy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

JOHN O. SNYDER

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, John O. Snyder today completes 41 years of service in the House of Representatives. This is a record of which we are all proud. He has rendered faithful service to the House and to his country. I know that

the Members on both sides of the aisle join with me in a sincere tribute to him. It is our wish that Johnnie Snyder may continue to serve in the House as long as he so desires and that the coming years hold only the best in store for him.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

A DAILY PRAYER AT NOON IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the daily news and radio announcements concerning the war must of necessity contain an account of the damage suffered by our ships, a list of our wounded, and the roll of honor of our heroic dead. These reports cause great unhappiness and leave our people in need of spiritual encouragement and moral support.

I suggest that we here in Congress supply this encouragement by holding a joint, informal, 5-minute session each day at noon in the rotunda of the Capitol where prayers will be said by our chaplains and guest chaplains. These prayers should be broadcast nationwide and made a part of our national life. Our prayer and the prayer of every American should be for the success of our cause and the welfare of our men in the armed forces. This service will afford us here in Washington and the people of the Nation a much-sought opportunity to join in daily prayer and tribute for our fellow Americans who have made the supreme sacrifice for our beloved country.

It will be a great step toward our much desired and needed national unity and an acknowledgment of our dependence upon the almighty God.

SECOND WAR POWERS BILL, 1942

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2208) to further expedite the prosecution of the war, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. SUMNERS of Texas, McLAUGHLIN, and HANCOCK.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill entitled "A bill to extend to April 15 the time for filing certain income-tax returns."

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of section 53 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the time for filing returns) is amended to read as follows: "Returns made on the basis of the calendar year shall be made on or before the 15th day of March in the case of a corporation, and on or before the 15th day of April in the case of an individual, following the close of the calendar year."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including part of an article by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen in today's Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram and a short editorial from my home paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on the importance of the Great Lakes shipbuilding facilities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Walter Lippmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Portland Oregonian.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram from the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN], chairman of the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the accident of the steamship *Struma*, the refugee ship.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, March 10, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JOHN M. MORIN

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce the death on yesterday of a former Member of this House, a man who represented the district I now represent, the Honorable John M. Morin, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Morin lived more than man's allotted threescore years and ten.

After several years in business, Mr. Morin went into politics, and was honored by being elected first as a member of the Common Council of the city of Pittsburgh. He was then for several years director of the department of public safety of that city. Following that, in the year 1913, he was elected a Member of the Congress and served continuously for 16 years, in 8 Congresses, from the Sixty-third to the Seventieth, inclusive. He was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs during the World War, and for a time in his later years of service in the House was chairman of that great committee. At the time of his retirement from the House, in 1929, the President, recognizing his great ability, appointed him a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, on which body he served honorably and well until his death yesterday.

Mr. Morin was a personal friend of mine. He was a very kindly, affable gentleman. During all his years of public life he rendered conscientious, faithful, and dutiful service, not only to his constituents but to his country as well. I know that many of the Members now here knew him personally and all will join in expressing sorrow and regret at his passing. In him was exemplified the type of character and the virtues which go to make a great public servant and a lovable personality. His departure from our midst will be mourned by countless thousands.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, arise to pay tribute to the memory of the late John M. Morin, who represented a district in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., and represented it well. For a num-

ber of years Mr. Morin was chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, and as such inaugurated a program for the expansion and further development of the great institution of West Point. This institution was very close to the heart of Mr. Morin and he gave much of his time and even spent considerable of his personal funds in developing the Military Academy, which stands today as a living monument to his beloved memory.

Many of the older Members of this House remember most favorably this kindly man; and we who knew him well remember him best as a loving father to the 10 children whom he raised in a true American way of life.

Personally I remember him for his kindness to me and for his sound judgment, and it was my good fortune to have drawn upon his great reservoir of understanding on many occasions.

For the last several years he had been serving in the capacity of Commissioner on the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, where again his kindly and sympathetic understanding of human nature permitted him to serve the Commission with honor and distinguished performance.

The country has lost the services of a great man at a time when his practical clear understanding of its problems is most needed.

His family has lost a loving father and I have lost a good friend, John M. Morin, a Christian gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have just preceded me in expressing my sincere sorrow at the death of John Morin, an outstanding citizen of Pennsylvania, who has given years of service to our Government in this body and in other capacities. Long before I came to Washington I knew of Mr. Morin as a distinguished Member of Congress from the great State of Pennsylvania. Since coming to Washington 5 years ago I learned to love him and developed an intimate friendship with him. I am sure the entire citizenship of Pennsylvania is cognizant of the great loss our State has suffered in the death of this outstanding Pennsylvanian.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein remarks made by Dorothy Thompson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Mr. Carleton B. Tibbetts, president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have received permission to insert in the RECORD a copy of the speech by Mr. Carleton B. Tibbetts, president of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. I hope every Member will read this, because here is some plain talk about at least 5,900 small industries in Los Angeles County—A Strange Tale of Aluminum, Making Planes the Hard Way, Lost—8,000 Bombers, Jitters, Jealousy, and Social Planning, and Some Other Flies in the War Ointment, together with a few plain statements on unity and really fighting hard to win this war.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 453, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 453), as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, as I have in mind some general agricultural matters, it is not my thought to devote much time to a discussion of the rule which I now present.

The rule is an open one. It is as wide as the entrance to a hay barn. It fits farming. Full freedom of action is provided. We can go "gee" or "haw." Speaking in terms of harness for the farm team, there are no blind bridles, no stiff bits with cruel curbs. The harness having both collars and breechbands we can pull or hold back, as we please. In plowing up or plowing under we can backfurrow or split the centers, whether using a many-bottom plow drawn by tractor or only a single 14-inch horse-drawn walking plow. We can follow the straight furrows in which our parents took pride or adopt the modern method of contour cultivation.

There is equally wide choice of farm implements. In conditioning the ground there are no restrictions as to types of

harrows, rollers, or pulverizers. Seed may be broadcast or sown by drill; planting, as preferred in corn, a single-row planter for stump ground, a wider and speedier planter for most fields. Harvesting of wheat may be with binder, header, or combine. Yes, if the season is wet and the grain field but a few acres, resort may be had to the cradle of our forefathers.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this rule gives the House absolute freedom of action, the freedom of the farm. It is the opposite of a so-called gag rule. We can vote up or vote down, divide or multiply, every item.

Reversing the usual order, the committee has had rather full debate before presentation of the rule. In the course of this debate some may have become convinced that consideration of certain activities should be curtailed or entirely excluded. With this view I may not in all cases take issue, but if there is to be any clearing out of dead timber and burning of brush, let us do it right here in this House. Hatchets, axes, and ladders are provided. Were we, for want of a rule, denied opportunity to pass upon the controversial items, it is safe to predict what would happen. That which was held to be out of order here would not be out of order over there. The empty grain sacks that we sent north might not, it is true, come back in the amended bill. With the advance of the season, though, they would be sent south. Judging from the past, we would receive, in some form, what we had rejected, receive it carefully wrapped in cellophane. On the outside of each package would be written "No alterations necessary. Take it or leave it." Then our only recourse would be through conferees. These farmer-minded men, hedged about by rigid rules, while doing their best to arrive at conclusions satisfactory to all the rest of us, would have a harder job than saving hay on a rainy day.

Let us then make hay here, make it while the sun shines, by adopting this rule and doing the work ourselves—doing it the way we want it done.

Mr. Speaker, as suggested in my opening statement, I wish briefly now to discuss two or three matters of general interest to agriculture. However, before doing so, I mention another thought. It was brought to my mind this morning when I opened a Missouri farm paper. "Let's Be Neighbors" is the caption above a paragraph under a picture showing a snow-covered rural mailbox.

In my years in this House I have come to think of my colleagues as neighbors. In saying this I refer to those on my left as well as those on my right. This center aisle is no "devil's lane," such as in rare cases have marked the boundary line between fussing farmers.

All of us want to be good friends and good neighbors, but when worn out and worried, we may occasionally forget. You and I, and especially if close contact has caused us to love the land, have like longings. With the coming of spring we grow restless, and sometimes as snappish as wild animals in a cage. This feeling, which God made a part of every normal human being, accounts, I believe,

for a considerable part of the complaint heard not only against Congress but against so many others in places of responsibility. This is a peevish period.

At such times even a Missourian may feel like kicking his "houn' dog aroun'," may actually be unkind to man's most faithful and forgiving friend. Today is such a time. For weeks news from the far-flung battlefield has not been the best. There is disappointment. The other fellow, regardless of who he is, is blamed.

I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that with the approach of spring you would enjoy getting back to a Texas barnyard and getting on your boots a substance which makes crops grow like magic. Springtime on the farm, with colts and calves, pigs and lambs, has its lure.

I dare say that in our love of Nature all of us are much alike. Few are entirely happy here. As an understanding constituent, a leading farmer, wrote, "You Members of Congress have your headaches and your heartaches just as we at home have."

Because of conditions over which we have no control, many of us, I believe, would prefer not again to be candidates except for what may seem the call of duty. For all in this War Congress, these are trying days. But I must discontinue such observations.

I speak now directly of farming. The rule which I have reported, as instructed by the Rules Committee, seeks to make in order further consideration of H. R. 6709, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The bill itself is a big one, but small as compared with the almost 2,000 pages making up the hearings. Very properly, the first witness called by the committee was Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard. Now, as a Missourian, I am naturally interested in this Cabinet position. Hon. Norman J. Colman, of St. Louis, having been the first to fill this place. Governor Colman, so-called because he had served as Lieutenant Governor of Missouri, was editor of Colman's Rural World, farm gospel for many folk half a century ago. He was also a practical farmer and a breeder and lover of good horses. Older residents of the Missouri metropolis may still recall seeing the Governor mounted on a high-wheel sulkey, driving his entry on the old St. Louis fair grounds. David M. Houston and Arthur M. Hyde, both from Missouri, also served as Secretary of Agriculture.

For the first time in the history of the United States, we now have as Secretary of Agriculture one born and reared on a farm, trained especially for farming, to which he has devoted his life. Claude R. Wickard, of Camden, Ind., was born on a farm that had been in his family since 1840. He has a background of a quarter century of active farming, having farmed with his father while in school. He was graduated from Purdue University, after which he took over complete management of the home farm and was active in farm organization work. He was named as a master farmer and his work in soil building and approved farm prac-

tices was recognized by outstanding awards. He was active in the A. A. A., being made chief of the corn-hog section in 1936. He was named Under Secretary of Agriculture in February 1940 and Secretary in September 1940. He continues to operate his 380-acre grain and livestock farm.

So much for some of the men who have filled the position, but let us now turn to the consideration of the office itself. We read:

The Department of Agriculture is charged by law with acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of the term.

Further on we read:

The Secretary of Agriculture exercises general supervision and control over the affairs of the Department and formulates and establishes general policies to be pursued by its various branches.

In the Congressional Directory I turn next to the Department of Labor, duties of the Secretary, and read:

The Secretary of Labor is charged with the duty of fostering, promoting, and developing the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, in improving their working conditions, and advancing their opportunities for profitable employment.

The definitions quoted are in striking contrast. It must be that the lines dealing with labor were written by an understanding friend of those who work with their hands, who earn their living by the sweat of their brows. It is militant; it has meaning. It is no "pussyfoot" pronouncement. I do not know who wrote concerning the duties of the Secretary of Agriculture. Surely it was no real farmer. So far as suggesting equality for agriculture, the words are weak and wobbly. Despite this, as we read that the "Secretary has control over the affairs of the Department," we realize that he is not without power.

It is time for agriculture to write a new charter for itself. Right now give to our Secretary of Agriculture, a real farmer, to understand that as he exercises all the authority given him—general supervision and control—as he battles as strongly and as sensibly for agriculture as in the past Secretaries of Labor, able and understanding men, have battled for labor, as the word is commonly used, 10,000,000 farmers and their families will be back of him. With such support he need have no fear of being fired.

From what I have said let it not be understood that I am endorsing the present Secretary of Labor. To fill that position there is needed now, as never before, a real he-man, one who has toiled in shop, factory, or mine, as the case may be; one who symbolizes somewhat the village blacksmith, with mighty muscles and sinews of steel. I do, though, note with approval the Department's desire to serve those in whose interest it was established—to serve these, but never to be unmindful of our Nation's needs.

I like Secretary Wickard. If he is given assurance of strong farmer support, which, if he is to succeed, he must have, I believe he will fight. But no general

can successfully lead a divided army against a united foe. His duty, whether or not it is so defined matters little, is to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the farmers of the United States—the producers, rather than the consumers. Administrator Henderson is showing plenty of interest in the latter, in those who want low-priced food, and who, if they fail to get it, will blame the farmer, not the middleman. I want Mr. Wickard to exercise full power delegated to him under the Price Control Act. If this means locking horns, let him lock them. If he must, let him fight Mr. Henderson, fight, fight hard, fight like—well, like MacArthur, fight for the farmer.

Do I want to see the farmer profiteer? I do not. All the farmer asks is to be placed in a position—and this means decent prices and sufficient help, real help, not farmerettes—so that he may be able to produce the meat, grain, and milk—food without which the war cannot be won.

Let farm prices advance just a little and there goes up from the financial centers cries of fear of inflation. Or there are those oversolicitous but ever-selfish pseudo friends of the farmer who warn against \$23.40 peak hog price or \$400- and \$500-acre farm land as a result of World War No. 1. Farmers have not forgotten. They want no repetition of those terrible times. There is no danger here. The burnt child fears the fire.

Mr. Speaker, I come now to mention farm help. On January 9, at hearings referred to, Secretary Wickard, in discussing farm-production problems, said:

For a while we said that we were concerned about the shortage of skilled labor. Last fall I made some statements which I thought were apropos in the situation, then pointing out that we should not take boys away from the farms who had been trained, who had a lifetime of experience in taking care of dairy herds, livestock herds, poultry farms, fruit farms, and other things; those activities must go on, I said, and production should not be jeopardized. Now we are coming to the point where we are concerned about the total supply of labor, unskilled as well as skilled, and I am afraid that the farm-labor problem is going to grow worse and worse. I do not think we can look to machinery to replace farm labor to a great extent, because we do not have the metals and other materials for the machinery.

Since that time, if I may judge from letters from farmers, the farm-help shortage is constantly becoming more serious. Discussing this subject, I wish to make it very clear that farmers as a class expect no deferment, and ask none. Individually, these men, who during most of their lives work to keep out of the hole, ask no more favored treatment, except for the public good, than that given the golf player who works to get in the hole. There are, though, many instances in which the farmers, as individuals, in order that the food necessary in the winning of the war may be provided, should be given full consideration by the local draft board. Only this morning I had a letter from a farmer who told of the situation in which he finds himself, with 460 acres of land, a large lot of livestock on hand, and the local draft board had called his boy. He said:

I would like to have my boy released from service until we can produce this year's crop. He will gladly return to service after this crop is produced. We want to do our full part in the war, and I truly believe he can do five times more good on the farm for a few months.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield with pleasure to my able colleague.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Did not the local board defer that young man?

Mr. NELSON. I understand not. I believe in the utmost patriotism, sincerity, and honesty of the local draft boards, but until they get more definite directions from General Hershey, they hesitate as to what they should do. The average farm boy is the last boy in the world to ask deferment for military service.

If the food-for-victory campaign fails, it will not be the farmer's fault. His 8-hour day—8 hours before dinner and 8 hours after dinner—stands for full production.

Food comes only from our farms. It is not produced on the sidewalks of New York. We look with confidence to the wheat fields, the soybean acres, the corn fields, the dairy barns, and feed lots, for what we must have, not only for ourselves, but later for many of our Allies, for those who fight with us on the side of civilization.

Finally, then, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and passage of the agricultural appropriation bill, which it makes in order.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am not as enthusiastic about this rule as is my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON]. The rule is all he says it is. I compliment him upon the unique manner in which he described the rule. I voted to lay the application for the rule on the table in the Rules Committee, along with some other members of the committee, because I believe in the general rules of the House. I am tired of having the Appropriations Committee place legislation in appropriation bills contrary to the rules of the House, thereby depriving the legislative committees from having an opportunity to consider and discuss the legislation, for which purpose they are specifically set up, created, and qualified. This is a wide-open rule. This rule says to the Committee on Appropriations: "All rules of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, any legislation you have seen fit to put in this bill shall be in order." That is what the rule says.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, legislation covering any subject whatsoever could be offered as an amendment to this bill?

Mr. MICHENER. No; the able gentleman is wrong. This rule makes in order anything that is now in the bill, even though it is there in violation of the rules of the House. However, the rule of germaneness still obtains—that is, any amendment offered must be germane to some part of the bill. I am not going to take any more time, but I do want to say that if this House retains the power and the dignity and the use-

fulness of its legislative committees, it must never grant an open rule like this except in matters of extreme necessity. Such occasions do arise. The House should embrace such occasions. In my judgment, such an occasion does not arise in reference to this bill. No question of national interest is involved. Therefore, I shall not vote for the rule, although I appreciate the logic of what the gentleman from Missouri has said—to wit, that this bill, if it passes the House, according to the rules of the House, will go to the Senate, and then the Senate will put some riders on it giving some particular benefits to some particular farmers, and then the Senate will claim the credit to the farmer and the Members of the House will not get the credit. To me that logic has no appeal. I think we ought to stand on our own feet. I do not think we ought to pass legislation here that should not be passed under the rules of the House, simply because some Senator may get the credit for putting it into the bill in the Senate, even though he does it in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. For a short question.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has said that this is against the dignity of the House. As I understand it, the rule exists for the convenience of the House and not the House for the convenience of the rules. Would the gentleman explain to some of us younger men why it is that the appropriation and legislative functions are divided in the House mechanism and organization?

Mr. MICHENER. That is a long story. I have but 5 minutes. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio is a diligent student and likes to dig into things. I suggest to him that he study the debate in the House in 1921 at the time the Budget System and this Appropriations Committee of 35 members were established. Before that time much appropriating jurisdiction was in the various legislative committees. It is a long story. There is a reason for it. If you want to make this a supercommittee, then pass rules just like this, and every time you pass a rule it makes it easier to pass another similar rule. In fact, the Committee on Rules determined earlier in the session that it would not pass any more rules like this rule for the Appropriations Committee. However, here we are again.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think the obvious answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio is that the legislation of the House covers too wide a scope for any one committee to handle it.

Mr. MICHENER. I think that is one good reason.

The hearings before the Appropriations Committee are executive. They are not public, as they are before other committees. The hearings are not released for the public and the Members of the House until the bill is brought before the House for consideration. The func-

tion of the Appropriations Committee is to report appropriations to implement laws previously passed by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this same type of rule has been sought and secured by this same subcommittee for the last 3 years. Certainly, this rule does not make in order emergency legislation. I realize this rule will be adopted. Maybe, however, this matter will be considered by the House and appropriate action taken when the next similar application comes up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations and have been for many years, during all of my service here in the House. I do not like the idea of the Committee on Appropriations bringing in legislation, especially legislation of a highly controversial character, and legislation which is bound to get us into trouble. I am going through this bill as quickly as I can and without attempting to discuss the merits of a single item involved. I am going to point out the high spots of legislation in this bill that are made in order by the rule which is under consideration. For over 100 years the rule in this House has been that appropriation bills should not carry legislation. That rule has been violated sometimes by unanimous consent. Sometimes with reference to some war item it must be violated to a certain extent to give us the speed that we need, but most generally it is a rule that deserves honest observation.

Now the major items in this bill that are brought in as a result are these: On the bottom of page 75 there is a contract authorization to the Secretary of Agriculture for the payment of parity payments, instead of a direct appropriation. This clearly is not in order without a rule. I have taken the trouble to figure up what the payments would be based on present prices, and those payments would run, instead of \$212,000,000 as last year, somewhere around \$350,000,000 or \$400,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I would rather not until I have finished my statement with reference to this situation.

Now, that contract authorization does not tell the House what it is up against. If we are going to have parity payments we ought to say how much we are going to spend for it, just as we have in the past, instead of a blanket contract authorization in the hands of the Secretary.

There is another provision in the proviso beginning on line 13, page 16. There is another provision with reference to parity payments on the bottom of page 78. I am not so sure that that particular item would be subject to a point of order, but I do think that the attention of the House should be called to the item at this time. It appears to be, and I have understood the majority members of the committee to contend that that provides a prohibition against the sale of Government-owned stocks of farm commodities

at less than parity prices. Let me say to you that it is not a prohibition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. It is not a prohibition. It is simply a prohibition against the use of administrative funds appropriated in that particular paragraph. Funds could be transferred into the Commodity Credit Corporation under the transferability clause and a new unit set up in the Commodity Credit for the sale of these commodities, and right within the scope of this bill it could be done.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I hardly have time. There are two other items that I wish to cover.

Mr. TARVER. Just for a few questions.

Mr. TABER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The provision to which the gentleman refers is not affected by this rule at all?

Mr. TABER. I appreciate that. That is not legislation. It is a limitation.

Then on page 84 there is an item authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to give to the Secretary of Agriculture \$70,000,000 for rehabilitation loans. That is clearly not in order without a rule. To my mind, that is bad.

Then on page 88 there is an item for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance to the Rural Electrification Administration \$10,000,000. I would not object particularly to that one, although I think it ought to come out of the Treasury if it is to come.

Then there is a provision for farm tenancy, for which funds are supposed to be provided, on page 80, at the bottom of the page, \$45,000,000 out of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Now, those are the main items. There are some others, for which I am sure no rule would be asked, but those are the main ones. Frankly, they are very involved propositions and should not be brought up here under a rule, in my opinion, and carried in an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The first item the gentleman mentioned, the one with respect to parity payments under the soil-conservation program—would that not be in order without a rule, if it were in a direct appropriation?

Mr. TABER. It would; but it is a contract authorization, and it is not in order, and it ought not to be a contract authorization.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Rules Committee has been criticized for bringing in gag rules and closed rules. A great deal of that criticism came from my colleague and friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. Today he objects to an open

rule, and I am pleased to say that I more or less agree with everything he has stated. I think a broad rule that makes in order legislation injected by the Appropriations Committee, though there may be some justification for this appropriation, is manifestly unfair to the legislative committee. The Appropriations Committee is assuming jurisdiction that is not theirs. I hope this is the last time that the Appropriations Committee will come in with a bill legislating for the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I only have 5 minutes.

Now, personally I shall vote for the rule, because I always believe in giving the Members of the House ample opportunity and privilege to vote on any important proposition.

My colleague, a member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON], has made an extraordinary effort to obtain the special rule to eliminate any points of order against many of the provisions in the bill. I fully appreciate the great interest he is taking in agriculture, meaning, of course, the farmers, not only of his district but of the United States. However, I fear, in his desire and efforts, he is urging and fighting for more than the farmers are entitled to or even asked for.

He is carrying out the wishes of leaders of the various agricultural organizations and the farm bloc in the House.

In view that I made it possible that this rule is before us, making many of the appropriations in order, I take the privilege of stating that I feel that the farm bloc and agriculture in general should realize and appreciate all that has been done for them in the last 10 years under the present administration.

Every report and all statistics indicate the farmers of our country are in better position today than ever before in the history of our country, and I feel that they should desist at this time from urging and demanding and forcing through additional unneeded appropriations when the country is confronted, as it is, with such a serious situation.

I feel that the farmers are just as patriotic as any other class of our people, but they do not seem, as yet, to realize that our security and liberties and freedom are being threatened.

Therefore, I hope that the farm agricultural leaders and the farm bloc, who should know and do know, will bring home to the American farmers the need of real cooperation, and eliminate personal selfish interests, so that we can utilize the funds available for the prosecution of the war. And what applies to the farmers should apply to all Americans alike at this critical time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, today I find myself in the unpleasant situation of opposing, for the second time within a couple of weeks, a special rule brought in by the Committee on Rules, of which I have been a member for several years,

and for every member of which I have the highest respect and warmest affection.

I am against this special rule because it would waive points of order against the pending Agricultural Department appropriation bill. The necessity for this rule is that the pending Agricultural Department bill includes legislative provisions, which is in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI of the Standing Rules of the House of Representatives.

The standing rule prohibiting the inclusion of legislation in appropriation bills was first adopted by the House in 1837—105 years ago. The standing rules of the House are based on sound legislative experience; they are founded on sound principles. When we depart from these general standing rules or seek to evade them we are inviting trouble. If we adopt this special rule we would be condoning an action by the Committee on Appropriations which would usurp the powers and authority of the Committee on Agriculture. It is wrong in principle. Much as I regret to be obliged to say so, I think this special rule ought to be defeated.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that he be permitted to speak out of order for 5 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th day of last November the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this House reported a bill to the House containing some 231 projects and amounting to nearly \$1,000,000,000. It undoubtedly is the largest rivers and harbors bill ever presented to the House of Representatives in the history of this Republic. In that bill are some 38 projects approved by agencies of this Government charged with the responsibility of the defense of this Nation as being of necessary defense value. In the committee rivers and harbors omnibus bill are many projects of a controversial nature. Several of these projects have heretofore been rejected by Congress.

I have today introduced a bill limited to those projects which have been considered of national defense value.

It reduces the committee bill by some \$600,000,000. The amount of my bill, containing these urgently needed defense projects, approximates \$400,000,000.

On May 21, 1940, the last rivers and harbors bill of this Congress was vetoed by the President. In the President's veto message he made a suggestion which has challenged my attention. I quote the President:

With respect to the few items in the bill that are of national defense value, I would be glad to approve separate legislation covering these projects.

He said he would consider a rivers and harbors bill limited to projects of a national defense value. The Nation was not at war on May 21, 1940, but the

Nation is at war now. It must be conceded by everyone that the President's suggestion of limiting river and harbor work to projects essential to national defense is of greater force now than it was when he made it in 1940. The bill which I have introduced today carries out the suggestion made by the President. And my purpose of introducing the bill is to eliminate many highly controversial projects, reduce the amount of the authorization and limit our action to those projects which will aid the Nation in winning this war.

Let me remind the House that the previous rivers and harbors bill, which was vetoed, totaled only \$110,000,000, while the pending rivers and harbors bill reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, totals nearly \$1,000,000,000, or nearly 10 times as much. If the President would veto a bill of \$110,000,000, certainly we have no right to expect that he is going to look with favor upon a bill of \$1,000,000,000.

I repeat, the purposes of introducing my bill in the House today covering the 38 projects deemed essential to national defense is to meet the requirements of the President's veto message and eliminating many controversial projects, reduce substantially the huge total of the omnibus bill, strengthen the effort of the Nation in our defense program, and thereby serve the Nation best. Let us recognize that the economic structure of our country is being taxed to the utmost. We must attune the legislative program of this Nation to that concept.

In this hour of the Nation's peril, when the American people are being asked to practice strict economy, practice self-denial, purchase Defense bonds, and contribute from the national income vast sums of money to carry on the Nation's war effort, we can encourage them and merit their confidence by our effort in the legislative branch of their Government to restrict our expenditures to those essentials for the preservation of our present form of government and the American way of life.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I also yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as a member of the subcommittee who helped in the preparation of this bill, I trust the rule will be adopted. There are 14 or 15 legislative and limitation provisions in the bill. They are clearly out of order, and the committee has no authority to report them. It therefore becomes necessary to get a rule to retain them in the bill. I recognize all the arguments that have been made against the adoption of a rule of this kind. First, that the committee exceeded its authority, which is correct; secondly, that it is an invasion of the legislative prerogatives of legislative committees, which is also correct; that it lends itself to abuses, and I admit that freely. But when all is said and done, there has got to be some latitude. You cannot generalize too freely on provisions

of this kind. Perhaps the best answer to the whole matter will lie in an analysis of the provisions in the bill to which objection has been made.

First, let me say that there is no committee that gets the perspective of a Government agency or a governmental department like the Committee on Appropriations. We have been in the committee for 5 weeks, early and late, mornings and afternoons, on this bill. There has been a constant parade of chiefs and bureau heads before us, so that we get a clear perspective of policy, administrative procedure, difficulties, abuses, and everything else that goes to make up departmental practice. In view of that fact, the committee can often recommend things that are in the public interest which would take interminable time if we had to resort to legislation.

For instance, there is a provision here to provide for cooperation with the State of Florida in connection with the Seminole Indian Reservation. The reason that is included is because the deer in Florida are the host to the cattle tick. When they escape to the Seminole Indian Reservation you cannot get them. The Bureau of Animal Industry cannot eliminate cattle ticks unless it has authority to cooperate with the State. So we ask that it be waived, and it would be waived if the rule is adopted.

There is a provision here for taking fees from the timber service and turning them back so that they inure to the benefit of private industry. It would take a long time to provide legislation on that subject. A bill would have to be introduced and there would have to be hearings. Why not waive it now in the interest of the public service?

There is a provision here for consolidating some laboratories. This would save money, it will put research under one roof, and it is very definitely in the interest of the public good.

That is one reason why the rule ought to be adopted. The second is that there are administrative difficulties in every department with which you have to deal, and the only way you can deal with them efficaciously is by putting in some limitation in an appropriation bill or perhaps by including a waiver.

For instance, there is an item with respect to travel fees for those who are in the farm-inspection service, where they travel within the confines of a certain city. Should we go to the trouble of bringing in a separate bill to cover a little item like that? Yet we cannot include it unless the rule is adopted.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, for example, does \$6,000,000 worth of work for the Crop Insurance Corporation. This represents a sizable sum. You have to make a provision for transfer of that money to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Therefore, it constitutes a legislative provision in the bill. Should it not be waived in the public interest and in the interest of good administration? My own answer is that it should be.

There is a provision for making it possible for the Farm Credit Administration to exact in advance fees for examinations from the Federal land banks and other credit agencies. If you do not do

this, they will have to come back after a while and ask for a separate appropriation. Why go through all of this legislative procedure when that can be done here expeditiously and in the interest of good administrative procedure?

There is a sliding scale provided for cutting down the money made available to the Secretary of Agriculture. The reason for that provision in the bill is that after we had instituted a number of curtailments in the appropriations we could not tell definitely how much the Secretary's office ought to be diminished.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are some items in controversy like the parity item. May I say that the House is not foreclosed in its right to deal with the matter. It can delete it. An amendment can be offered on the floor to delete it if the Committee of the Whole so desires. So that the House, after all, is serving a useful purpose in adopting the rule, retaining good legislative provisions here that are necessary, and not call for the interminable procedure of going through legislative committees, yet retaining its right to knock out any provision if it so desires. The House loses no rights or privileges. The rule, therefore, should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual rule. It is a routine rule. It is the same rule we had last year on this bill and the same rule we had the year before.

Furthermore, it is a necessary rule. It is a rule without which we cannot have adequate consideration of this bill. It is a rule without which the House of Representatives cannot adequately and efficiently discharge its duties in the enactment of this legislation.

It has been said here by a distinguished gentleman from Illinois that he opposes this rule because he wants to save money. That is exactly what this rule does. It saves money. For example, instead of making an appropriation for parity payments, the item to which my friend from New York referred just now, under this rule we merely authorize commitments. We save \$212,000,000 on that item alone.

Mr. Speaker a special rule is like a surgeon's knife. It is a sharp instrument. It is capable of doing either much good or much evil. We have had rules in days gone by which were in effect gags under which you could neither amend nor debate. But here you have a rule which extends and enlarges the privileges both of debate and amendment. A gag rule limits and contracts the rights of the Member. This rule broadens and extends the privileges of the Member. It provides a broader field and a wider latitude in the consideration of the bill—one of the most important of all the supply bills of the session.

But they say it authorizes the consideration of items and provisions which would otherwise be subject to a point of order. That is true. That is true of every regular supply bill reported to the

House. All of them, and this bill in particular, carry and have always carried items that are subject to points of order. Such items have been carried year after year and will continue to be carried in this bill and, more or less, in all supply bills.

I recal. that in the Sixty-fifth Congress, Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, was elected to the House—one of the most useful and most remarkable men who ever sat as a Member of this body, and one of the most indefatigable. Shortly after he came to the House he spent an entire summer vacation studying rules and procedure and the following session, when the first supply bill came in, he secured a chair and took his seat here in the Well of the House. That was before the day of the microphone and it was sometimes difficult to hear either the Clerk at the desk or the Members on the floor. So he took his seat down here in front of the desk and as the bill was read lodged a point of order against every provision on which there was any question of authorization or legislation. And when the Clerk finished reading the bill it had been stripped clean. Little was left but the skeleton when it went to the Senate.

But note the aftermath. When the bill came back from the Senate every item that had gone out on a point of order had been restored. Mr. Blanton was quick to see the futility of the proceedings. He had not only failed to accomplish anything by his parliamentary crusade against the bill but in the process he had brought about two untoward results. In the first place, he had deprived the House of its constitutional right to initiate legislation and, in the second place, he had prevented the consideration of some of the most important features of the bill on their merits.

And that is what failure to adopt this rule will do. It will arbitrarily and summarily eliminate many items in the bill without giving the House the opportunity to either debate or vote on them. Would it not be better to take up these items and debate them and then either vote them down or vote them up as the House prefers? Is not it better to let all Members of the House pass on them than to let one Member of the House throw them out on a point of order? The fact that we have this rule will not prevent the House from voting to strike them out if it wants to strike them out. The rule merely gives the House the opportunity to pass on them. That is what we are here for.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Committee on Rules and the proponent of the pending resolution.

Mr. NELSON. In other words, the only question is whether the House shall write this legislation or whether it shall be written in part by another body.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is precisely the question involved in the adoption or rejection of this resolution—whether we shall be permitted to debate these items on their merits and then

vote them up or down, as the House after deliberation determines, or whether the House shall have no voice in their adoption or rejection. And not least, whether the House shall have an opportunity to exercise its constitutional prerogative to initiate legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the gentleman tell us what are the main items in this bill which this rule is designed to protect?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are 40 or 50 such items in the bill. I would not have time to cite them in the minute I have remaining; but the gentleman from New York enumerated the major items and emphasized 2 of them in particular. One was the provision on parity payments, under which, as I have said, we propose, instead of appropriating \$212,000,000, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make commitments.

The purpose of that amendment is to save money, to reduce appropriations because if it goes out on a point of order it will be either reinserted in the Senate or be superseded by an appropriation of \$212,000,000 as in the current law.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman would not like to leave the impression with his colleagues or with the people of this country that the Committee on Agriculture is not perfectly capable of handling agricultural legislation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The larger number of items in the bill to which this rule refers are not questions of legislation, but questions of authorization, so small and in such detail that it would be impracticable for any committee of the House to initiate legislation merely to make them in order. Some of them have been carried in this bill for 35 years.

Mr. MURRAY. This is the fourth year I have been in the Congress. I should like to state that I believe one member of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], knows more about agricultural legislation than any group of people on the floor of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I heartily join the gentleman in the fine tribute he pays to the gentleman from Georgia. It will be observed that the gentleman from Georgia favors giving the House an opportunity to debate these questions and then vote on them, instead of knocking them out on technical points of order, to be returned by another body.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will follow the usual routine and agree to the resolution in order to have the advantage of the combined knowledge and wisdom of the House in the consideration of this important legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 93, noes 30.

So the resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Eugene Casey at the Washington day dinner at Fort Worth, Tex., on February 23, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6709, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. How much time in general debate remains?

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House on yesterday there are 1½ hours of general debate today.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that possibly we should give some serious consideration to the whole purpose of the agricultural program as we approach a vote on this bill. I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding on the part of many of our people about the purpose of any agricultural appropriation bill. I think it is unfortunate that we have Members who, in all good faith, stand here in this Well and make the charges that have been made quite recently to the effect that the farmers are already getting more than they ought to get and that there is not any reason for passing a bill simply to give the farmers some more gravy out of the Public Treasury.

I do not know whether all of you received the pamphlet I received this morning from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration or not. I am sure if you did that many of you have not read it, because we all receive a great many things we do not have time to read. But I hope you will take time to read and study this pamphlet. It is short. It is clear. It gives up-to-the-minute figures which I think are exceedingly interesting. It shows graphically the comparison between the income of the farmers today

and in 1929, and the income in nonfarm groups of our cities and the income in 1929.

We all look back upon 1929 as that great year in which everybody was making so much money. We talk about the great income of our industries and the high wages and the universal employment at that time. In 1929 farm prices were 20 percent higher than they are today, yet industrial wages are today higher than they have ever been in the history of the Nation. The nonfarm income today is greater than it was in 1929, but the farmers' income is only 80 percent of what it was in 1929. I am quoting from figures released just this morning by the Department of Agriculture.

Those figures, in another way, show that the income of the average citizen today will buy one-fourth more food than it would buy in 1929, and yet when we dare to suggest that the farmer is justly entitled to get parity for his products we are told, "Oh, it will set off an unhappy inflationary spiral that will wreck us all." Possibly those who present that line of argument do so believing they are correct, but I cannot feel that they have thought this thing through. How is it possible to set off that dangerous, inflationary spiral simply by bringing the farmers' income up to something like what it was back in the days when everybody was employed and prosperous. Even in 1929 the farmer was the least prosperous element in our population.

Today the farmer is making less than he was; today the average city man is making more than he was; and yet I do not think anyone who can think back 12 or 13 years will deny the fact that even in those days the farmer got a relatively small percentage of the national income. I simply think that those of us who criticize the efforts that are being made to improve agriculture, who criticize every appropriation that is made to enable agriculture to improve its own situation, should give some thought to the disparity that exists between agricultural and nonagricultural groups. I want to call your attention, too, to a very unfair statement that is made so often when the appropriation bill comes up for agriculture. Statements are made, or the statement was made last year, because, of course, this bill has \$400,000,000 or more than that; nearly one-half billion cut out from what it was last year. Yet we were told that Congress had appropriated a billion dollars to give to the farmers. And some of you do not realize or do not seem to realize that there was but \$212,000,000 of that that went out in the way of the parity payments about which they are talking. Less than one-fifth of the sum total of the agricultural appropriation bill was distributed in the form of those payments that it is so often said were made to the farmer.

Most of that billion dollars was used to operate the various agencies of the Department of Agriculture. I am talking now about those bills that have been criticized so severely in the past, when the agricultural appropriation included, for instance, the Bureau of Public Roads. I do not know why the farmer should be

blamed for all the cost of transporting all the products from New York City to Atlanta by truck, yet that is being done and it is all charged to agriculture, as are all of the activities of the Department of Agriculture, including such agencies as the food stamps and the Farm Security which are in large part direct relief agencies giving even larger benefits to cities than to rural areas. Every one of the activities of one of the most far-reaching departments of the Nation has been charged up to the farmer. We have been told on this floor by Members who, apparently, did not know any better, that all of that billion dollars per year was being given to the farmer as parity payments. About 20 cents out of the dollar of your last agricultural appropriation bill was used to make these adjustment payments to your farmer.

So I beseech those of you who are so ready to stand here and speak of payments you are going to make to the farmer, and who charge that they are causing the prices in this country to go into an inflationary spiral, to think of the facts for a moment before being so free with criticism. This bill specifically provides that no parity payments shall be made except where payments are required to bring the farmer's price up to parity. Let us enact legislation like this bill, and bring the price of farm products up to a parity. I am not asking that you give the farmer more than his share, I am not asking that you pay him overtime or double time for the times he works on Sundays, or for the long afternoons he works long after every shop is closed in the surrounding towns, nor for the hours he puts in before daylight. I am not asking you to pay anything to him except a mere parity, which would assure him, if he should be raising cotton, about 18 cents an hour for his work. I do ask you that you at least leave the present level, which will permit him to make about 18 cents an hour for his work. I don't ask you to give him double time or time and a half, but just enough for his crop so that he will make 18 cents an hour. Let us pass a bill here that will enable the farmer to know that he will receive parity for what he grows, let us have a bill that will enable him by the sale of his own products to get a reasonable price, and if you do, you will not have to pay out any subsidies to the farmer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. KERR. As I understand it the farmers of this country constitute about one-third of our population. Will the gentleman tell us what percentage of the national income the farmer receives for his products?

Mr. POAGE. About 9 percent.

Mr. KERR. My recollection is that it is just a little more than that.

Mr. POAGE. It may run as high as 11 percent, if you include the payments that the Government has made.

Mr. KERR. And one-third of the people of the Nation, who do a business quite as important as any other business, receive less than 11 percent of the national income.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, and I do not think anybody can contend that the farmers are robbing the public when that is all they get.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. A statement was inserted in the RECORD yesterday, giving the percentages from 1930 to 1940, and in 1940 the farm income was 7.2 percent of the national income.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. For a long time it was 7 percent, and even now, with Government aid, it is less than 11 percent. In any event, the farmer is not getting his fair share of the national income, and unless the farmer's income is increased, he simply will not be able to increase food production as is needed to win the war. The farmer is not going to strike, but farm labor is scarce and high, farm machinery is scarce and costs lots of money. The cost of farming has been going up rapidly. No matter how willing the farmer is to work long hours and 7 days per week, he simply cannot produce the needed crops unless we see to it that he has enough income to pay his running cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

CIVILIAN DEFENSE BUNGLING

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, with our very existence as a Nation at stake; with every effort being made to build up our military and naval strength so that we may crush the forces of aggression who would enslave us, it is imperative that we have national unity, and above all, confidence in our Government.

We must have that unity and confidence if we are going to win this war.

Therefore, it behooves us, as Members of the legislative branch of our Government, to do all we can to promote unity and confidence, and to put down and do away with those things which tend to undermine them.

To my mind, nothing is doing more to undermine public confidence than the bungling and frivolous manner in which a vital and important branch of our defense program—the matter of civilian defense—has been and is being carried on.

Of course, the Office of Civilian Defense is a relatively new agency, organized to deal with a matter about which we, in this country, have had no previous experience. Some mistakes might therefore be anticipated and condoned, but we have the right to expect that the responsible officials of that agency would at least have some slight conception of the object and purpose for which it was primarily created, or ought to have been created, namely, the protection of civilian life and property. The sad fact is, however, that they have not demonstrated any such understanding. Instead of concentrating their activities on air-raid precautions, they have used a large part of their funds to carry on various sociological and entertainment pro-

grams more related to Sunday-school picnics than to the fierce realities of war.

While our people throughout the country have been crying out for instructions as to what to do in case of an air raid, and how to take measures for their protection; while they vainly seek instruction in the use of gas masks, in the handling of incendiary bombs, and in first-aid work; while they await the production and distribution of gas masks, steel helmets, auxiliary fire-fighting apparatus, and other necessary equipment, what do we find the vital and important Office of Civilian Defense to be doing?

Up until the time Dean Landis recently took charge of that agency, it was devoting its energies and funds in a large measure to such frivolous activities as these:

Hiring a professional dancer, at \$4,600 per year, to "develop dancers, rhythmic exercises, and the like, particularly for children who might be congregated together in times of disaster, such as air raids and the like."

Hiring a Hollywood movie star to arrange for public entertainments.

Hiring a colored track star, at \$3,200 per year, to serve as a "roving staff assistant" on racial relations.

Hiring a number of racial relations advisers at \$4,600 per year.

Hiring a newspaperman, at \$12.77 per day and expenses, to go around the country writing "human-interest stories" relating to civilian defense.

Hiring a football coach, at \$4,600 per year, to promote sporting exhibitions of all kinds and encourage physical recreation programs.

Hiring a consultant on labor problems at \$22.22 per day.

Setting up a Know Your Government Division, with a chief receiving \$8,000 per year, consultants receiving up to \$22.22 per day and expenses, and a number of other highly paid executives.

Setting up a Physical Fitness Division, with a large number of high-salaried employees receiving up to \$5,600 annually.

Setting up a Youth Activities Division to carry on various activities among the younger people.

None of these activities and others I could mention have the slightest relationship to the ostensible purpose of the Office of Civilian Defense, which ought to be to provide for the protection of life and property in case of air raids. Just why they should have been allowed to have been carried on in the first place is difficult to understand, but what is most deplorable is that many of these activities are still to be continued under the new head of the agency, Dean Landis, of the Harvard Law School.

It is true that Mr. Landis has made some changes in the organization which he inherited from his predecessor, which do away with some of the criticisms which have been leveled against it.

However, in the case of the Physical Fitness Division, its activities and personnel are simply being transferred to another Government agency, under Mr. McNutt. The public money will thus continue to be spent for the physical-fitness programs.

Mr. Landis has definitely stated that the activities being carried on by Mr. Melvyn Douglas, the movie star, will be continued despite the recent action by Congress in prohibiting the use of any of the \$100,000,000 civilian-defense fund for public entertainments, dancing, and so forth.

Testifying last week before the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I have the honor to be a member, Mr. Landis pointed out that the administrative funds for his agency come not from a direct appropriation by Congress but from emergency funds allocated to it by the President, which are not subject to the limitation which Congress recently imposed. This is just another example of how the will of Congress can be thwarted by Government agencies through the use of lump-sum appropriations.

It will be recalled that the Office of Civilian Defense was created by Executive order of the President on May 20, 1941. It is an agency or division of the Office for Emergency Management, for the support of which Congress has appropriated lump-sum amounts to the President. The first allotment made to the agency by the President was in the amount of \$931,000, of which there had been spent, up to January 31, 1942, some \$365,000, of which \$126,000 went for travel allowances. The agency has a total personnel of over 800, of whom 117 serve without compensation. The present pay roll, on an annual basis, is approximately \$1,500,000, not counting the salaries of 99 employees who are on loan from other agencies.

The President's Executive order setting up the Office of Civilian Defense provides that the Director shall coordinate Federal and State activities, assist State and local governments in establishing defense councils and other agencies for civilian defense, plan measures designed to afford adequate protection of life and property in the event of emergency, sponsor the training of civilians in different civilian defense programs, and so on. Section 5 provides for the establishment of a voluntary participation committee to serve as an advisory and planning body "in considering proposals and developing programs designed to sustain national morale and to provide opportunities for constructive civilian participation in the defense effort." Section 6 empowers the Director to "appoint such additional advisory committees with respect to State and local cooperation, national morale, civil defense planning, civilian participation, and related defense activities, as he may find necessary or desirable."

It was under sections 5 and 6 of the Executive order that the so-called "frills and furbelows" of the Office of Civilian Defense were set up. It is now apparent that some of these activities, instead of building up national morale, have tended to undermine the faith of the people in their Government, which we must all admit is a serious thing, especially in time of war. Legislative action by the Congress restricting the Office of Civilian Defense to activities directly connected

with the protection of civilian life and property is clearly called for under the circumstances.

Recently Congress passed an act authorizing an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to provide protection of persons and property from bombing attacks. When this legislation was before the House, a provision was originally written into the bill transferring the Office of Civilian Defense to the War Department. This action was taken largely as a result of the dissatisfaction with, and criticism of, the administration of the agency under its civilian head, and because of the feeling that the military authorities were better qualified to carry on the work. This provision was subsequently eliminated in the Senate, and was not a part of the act as finally passed. I am of the opinion that the House acted wisely at the time, and I hope the transfer of the agency to the War Department will again be given consideration.

When the appropriation bill providing the \$100,000,000 of civilian defense funds was subsequently before the House, a limitation was written into the measure prohibiting the use of any of the money "to promote, produce, or carry on instructions or to direct instructions in physical fitness by dancers, fan dancing, street shows, theatrical performances, or other public entertainments." The Senate retained the provision and it became law. Unfortunately, however, it has not been effective in stopping the activities which it clearly prohibited, the reason being that the limitation applied only to the \$100,000,000 appropriated by the bill, and not to the emergency funds previously allocated to the Office of Civilian Defense by the President. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made an effort to amend the bill so that the limitation would have applied to all funds used for civilian defense, from whatever source obtained, but his amendment was ruled out of order as constituting legislation on an appropriation bill. Hence further action by the Congress is necessary in order that its effort to restrict the use of civilian defense funds to the protection of civilian life and property may be made effective.

At the hearing last week before the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following colloquy with reference to this matter occurred between Director Landis and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]:

Senator McKELLAR. Then, as I understand it, notwithstanding the limitation that the law put on it, you are using other moneys that come into your hands for carrying on these things that you are prohibited by law from using this appropriation for, is that right?

Mr. LANDIS. Well, in a sense, that is right.

Senator McKELLAR. In a sense. I think it is absolutely right in all senses. I think what you are doing is just using the funds that come into your hands in another way for the very purpose that you are prohibited from using them by this law.

When Mr. Landis said he would follow the limitation set up in the \$100,000,000 civilian defense fund, Senator McKELLAR added:

Senator McKellar. But you use the money that comes into your hands from other sources in direct violation of that law. In other words, what happens is this: You have got a fund coming from two sources. The larger part of that fund of \$100,000,000 comes from Congress under a law that prohibits you from using it for certain purposes, and yet you indirectly evade that law by spending for these prohibited activities, by using the other fund on the ground that that it is not hedged about with that prohibition.

Senator McKellar thus makes clear that until Congress regains control of all the funds going to the Office of Civilian Defense many of the activities which have been subject to criticism because they have no direct relation to civilian defense will be continued. Congress has already definitely stated its intent in the matter, and while the Office of Civilian Defense may be within the letter of the law in continuing to carry on certain prohibited programs with Presidential funds not within the reach of the congressional prohibition, it certainly is not within the spirit or purpose of the law in so doing.

Not only has the Office of Civilian Defense wasted public money sorely needed for civilian defense by engaging in non-essential and frivolous activities, but it is filled with incompetents and misfits who are not capable of carrying on its primary functions. A large part of the personnel were recruited from other Government agencies, including the W. P. A., and few have the slightest qualifications for the work in which they are engaged. Should any section of our country be subjected to an air raid, this incompetence may result in a tragic and unnecessary loss of life and property. A thorough housecleaning is in order, and it cannot come too soon. No effort should be spared to secure the most qualified and experienced persons to carry out this important program.

While I realize it may be difficult to secure the services of persons experienced in actual air raids, at least it should be possible to place at the head of the agency, and in key posts, men who have at least made a thorough study of the subject.

There must be some people in this country who have witnessed at first hand the air-raid measures taken in England and who are acquainted with their workings. Certainly our military authorities have some knowledge of the matter.

Measures have been introduced in the other branch looking to the transfer of the Office of Civilian Defense to the War Department, and I am in hopes that they will be favorably considered so that the House, which has previously voted for the transfer, may again have the opportunity to act on the matter.

In the meantime the least the officials of the agency can do is confine their activities to matters strictly related to the protection of life and property. Our people are not interested in rhythmic dancing, physical-fitness programs, or public entertainments. These will not save them from bomb splinters or protect their homes from fires caused by incendiary bombs. They are simply a waste of public funds, which results only in undermining morale and shaking public confidence.

I agree 100 percent with Senator Byrd, of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, in saying to Dean Landis:

I want to make the suggestion that the best way to restore the confidence of the people of the country in the Government, in my judgment, is to strip the organization of these useless frills, stop talking about the physical-fitness part of it. I do not think they have any place whatever in the organization. The activities of the organization should be devoted to what may be regarded as actual protective defense.

Likewise I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Doughton], also a member of the joint committee, who said:

The morale of the people seems to be greatly disturbed, the unity of the people seems to be seriously affected by the publicity that has been given to what has taken place in your agency, and it is going to make, in my opinion, the financing of our war program much more difficult. The taxpayers are complaining. They are complaining in the most critical way, the most critical language. They are willing to support the war program, they are anxious to do it, they are anxious to cooperate in every way, but they are criticizing certain things that the agencies themselves are doing. They are using that as an excuse, in my judgment, as a reason for failing to wholeheartedly cooperate in this war effort, paying the taxes, giving up their boys, their husbands to go into the Army. * * * I think it is more serious than a lot of people realize.

Not only is this true of the general public, but the voluntary civil-defense workers in the local communities are themselves losing heart in their work, many of them, because of their inability to secure equipment, instruction, and cooperation from Washington. Virtually the whole burden of civilian defense has fallen on the State and local governments, and on the individual voluntary workers, who in many instances have had to go to great personal expense in securing what little equipment they have. My own State of Massachusetts recently appropriated \$2,500,000 for civilian defense, and I assume other States have taken similar action.

Of course, the State and local governments have some responsibility in the matter, and it is proper that they should share the expense of protecting their people, which I know they will do. But they expect, and should receive, full cooperation from Washington.

The \$100,000,000 fund which Congress has provided contemplates the spending of \$57,200,000 for emergency fire-fighting equipment, \$29,900,000 for gas masks, \$8,000,000 for steel helmets, protective clothing, and insignia, and \$4,900,000 for emergency medical supplies and equipment. These are all to be supplied to the local communities on the basis of need, indicating that those communities which can be supposed to take care of their own requirements to the extent of their ability to do so.

Let me say in conclusion that I do not wish to seem too critical of Mr. Landis, who only recently took over the responsibilities as head of the Office of Civilian Defense. Most of the activity about which such severe complaints have been made occurred before he assumed office. He has already made certain improve-

ments in the agency and doubtless will make more. In 30 days he is to report back to the Joint Committee on Non-essential Expenditures regarding the reforms he is now undertaking. However, he must carry out his orders, and he construes those orders as requiring the continuation of certain functions which I believe a majority of the Congress and certainly the majority of our citizens feel ought to be discontinued.

Hence, it is desirable that the Congress legislate on the matter, transferring the office to the War Department, where it belongs, and prescribing definite limitations under which the agency shall function, so as to confine its activities to strictly protective measures.

We learned our lesson at Pearl Harbor by not being prepared. Let us not repeat it in the matter of civilian defense. It is nothing short of a crime the way this important program has been bungled thus far.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman believe that it is entirely possible for the people of this country to be united upon the matter of prosecuting this war, and at the same time also impossible for us to bring about unity on a lot of questions which are not incidental to the war, but which can be deferred until the war proposition is settled?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think the great trouble with the whole situation is that the executive department takes on to itself rights and privileges not granted by the Congress. We are here either to aid in the prosecution of the war with a unity of purpose to accomplish the defeat of our opponents, or we better not try to legislate at all, if we cannot have the harmony that must occur in legislation to prosecute the war. The gentleman understands that matters that I have referred to in my remarks are from hearings held last week by the committee on nondefense items, and that Senator Byrd, Senator McKellar, and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Doughton] all very seriously criticized this method of carrying on the procedure to which I have referred, under so-called civic defense, which has nothing whatever to do with the Executive protecting our people back home and supplying them with gas masks and all of the equipment necessary to defense in time of war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the matter which I had in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, today the future of Farm Security Administration must be decided. But let us not decide it in terms of dollars and cents. Let us talk about something more important than dollars and cents. Let us talk about human values, about freedom from want, about rehabilitation in citizenship. Those are the things I have seen come from the work of the Farm Security Administra-

tion, and to me they transcend dollars and cents.

Surely every man here knows of the tragic circumstances to which the small farmers were reduced during the past 15 years. Time after time we have seen sharecroppers, tenants, even landowners who were destitute. Many of them were broken in health and broken in spirit. Year after year they were beaten down into the soil they tilled. Yet I have seen those people brought back, seen them made useful, seen them taught to be of self-sustaining, seen them achieve a degree of independence. I have seen those things happen in the lean years, to people who could be reached only through one agency, the rural rehabilitation program of farm security. Some folks say it cost a lot of money. Actually it costs very little to help one of these families, but whatever the cost, we have got something to show for it.

Why were those people destitute? Were they willing to work? If they got hungry, if their children died because there was no money to buy medicine, if they learned to steal, whose fault was it? A benevolent society often found it easy to say they were too sorry to work, that they got what they deserved.

As a matter of fact, to work was all that most little farmers knew. They were born to toil, year in and year out. In the cold and wet of winter or the heat and drought of summer it was always the same. Sick or well, the crops had to be tended. Ragged clothes, broken-down furniture, the picture seldom changed. And always in the fall the same pitiful little pile of produce, going to pay debts and interest. Sometimes they were stripped of their meager resources by crop failure or bad prices; sometimes by grasping landlords or supply agents. Many were untrained even in simple business calculations, untaught in modern agriculture. They were easy victims.

They are the people who have been reached by rehabilitation. God only knows how they managed to keep going, to keep trying. But keep trying they did, and now rehabilitation has proved that a helping hand and wise counsel is what they needed to be able to stand on their own feet.

Rehabilitation has taught them something about the business of farming, about balanced expenditures, about diversification, about the importance of livestock. It has taught them to grow gardens and to produce a year-round food supply. It has taught them how to plan their work—and their future. These are simple, rudimentary things—but terribly important to people who have been denied this training. Rehabilitation has helped the little farmer to brighten his home, to have new pieces of furniture occasionally, to have flowers in the yard, and farm machinery in the barn. But more than all these it has brought security, confidence, citizenship, the right to hold up his head. I know these things are true, because I have seen them. I have seen derelicts made into independent, useful citizens. I have seen those men learn to take a part in community organization and advancement. They were worth the investment.

No; I am not talking about dollars and cents. I am not even discussing the absolute necessity for all-out food production which in itself is justification enough for the continuation of this program. I am talking about human values. I am talking about freedom from want. Those are the real objectives we achieve through farm security.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, on Monday, March 2, 1942, I spoke to this House at length regarding an agreement between Sidney Hillman, of the War Production Board, and Donald Nelson, head of that Board, whereby manufacturers of women's clothing were not permitted to bid on Army clothing contracts. The argument was advanced that, in view of the fact that the two million or more men who are in the Army and more to go into the Army are no longer purchasing clothes in civilian life, therefore the manufacturers and workers making men's garments were entitled to this business. I pointed out the fact that private industry was deprived of some 600,000,000 pounds of wool and nearly a billion yards of various types of cloth, and properly so, under priority rulings to supply the defense needs; that it will require 563,123,000 shirts, field jackets, trousers, overcoats, mackinaws, coats, cotton and woolen drawers, and cotton and woolen undershirts to supply an Army of 6,000,000 men for 2 years; that it was absolutely impossible for the present men's garment industry to supply that demand without expanding tremendously both in floor space, workers, and machines and that the Government could not take this tremendous amount of material out of the market and then deny contracts to garment workers making ladies' garments without throwing thousands of these workers out of work.

I now wish to call the attention of the House to a situation existing in Toledo, Ohio. I am informed that there are 17,000 Negroes in that city and that it has been extremely difficult for these Negroes to obtain employment outside of W. P. A. or N. Y. A. There are approximately 9,000 white women employed in the factories of that city, according to the information I have. I am informed that there are no colored women employed in a Toledo factory, even as charwomen or scrubwomen. I am informed that colored men and women who are heads of families are unable to find employment in these factories, even though a great many of these plants are working on Government orders making defense material paid for by the taxpayers of the Nation. Some of these 17,000 Negroes are property owners; they all pay indirect taxes and, I believe, are entitled as American citizens, to have the same rights to work as other citizens, white or colored, have.

In August 1940, a group of these Negroes, trying to relieve the situation, got together and contacted Government officials with the idea in mind of trying to find some kind of defense employment for these unemployed Negroes. I have before me a number of letters from offi-

cials of the Defense Contract Service of both the Cleveland and Washington offices.

I have also before me a copy of a letter written by the Secretary of War, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, pertaining to this matter. There is no doubt in my mind from the facts as presented to me that this group of Negroes were encouraged by these Government officials to set up a cooperative association with a promise of obtaining defense business. They were encouraged to organize and did organize the American Enterprise Associates, Inc., a cooperative association, the purpose of which was to acquire in some way factory space and machinery to take Government contracts for Army clothing. They were told by the Government officials that this was the only way that they could participate in defense contracts for the manufacture of Government material.

They were further told that they had to have an organization with which the Government could deal, that if they could perfect an organization, acquire factory space and machinery, that the Government would give them contracts. Following the instructions of the Government they perfected this organization on October 5, 1940, after making frequent trips to Washington. On November 5, 1940, this group were low bidders on 5,500 Army overcoats. They were informed that the bid could not be accepted, because the factory was not yet ready. On August 13, 1941, Paul A. Gerhart, Jr., of the Defense Contract Service notified this group, nearly 1 year after they were incorporated, that they could not bid on any Army clothing contracts, because:

The sewing, stitching, and garment industry is one in which even with present defense orders there is considerable unemployment and many idle factories. It is the opinion of the office concerned that to make an exception to their practice of discouraging the organization of new companies in this field would only aggravate an already serious situation within the industry. I am advised further that it would, therefore, not be a sound economic policy, even though the cause is a worthy one, to further expand this industry.

Is it not strange that it took these officials almost a year to discover that there was unemployment in this industry? Is it not strange that this group was permitted to spend money, mortgage their homes, and were encouraged by these very Government officials to organize a company, only to be informed that because of these reasons they would not even be permitted to bid on an Army clothing contract?

On August 25, 1941, the American Enterprise Associates, Inc., under Mr. Olander J. Smith, president, accepted an invitation on the part of Army officials to bid, and did bid, on 35,000 wool overcoats. They were low bidder, being 68 cents per coat below the next lowest bidder. Despite the fact that the bid of the American Enterprise group was 68 cents lower, they were not given the contract.

Mr. Chairman, there are 17,000 Negro people in the city of Toledo, Ohio, including 5,000 Negro children enrolled in school. Many of these people are graduates of the University of Michigan, Ohio

State, Oberlin College, University of Illinois, Howard University, Northwestern, and many other institutions.

Mr. Olander J. Smith, president of this cooperative company, is a graduate of Northwestern University law school, attended the University of Minnesota, Howard University, and Columbia University. He has had 9 years' practice at the bar and 20 years' experience in business. I have examined the statement of the Ohio Employment Service personally and find there many colored people listed as having had anywhere from 5 months to 34 years' experience in the various branches of the garment industry.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that these worthy colored people of my State can only furnish soldiers and taxpayers and cannot find work outside of Government institutions, like W. P. A. and N. Y. A.? Does that condition exist in my State of Ohio? That they can have no part in necessary, emergent war work?

Mr. ENGEL. That is the situation in the city of Toledo, according to information given me.

Sewers, cutters, markers, and every type of labor necessary in that industry are found there, and yet this group can find no employment outside of N. Y. A. and W. P. A. A white supervisory staff, I am informed, is ready to assist them. Single persons cannot get on relief or W. P. A., but are forced to beg or forced to crime. Here we have a situation where the Government is letting, or will let, contracts for over 563,000,000 items of clothing which cannot possibly be made by the groups within the industry itself, and yet this group who have been encouraged by the Government for over a year, followed instructions, mortgaged their homes, spent money, took up collections in churches—nickels, dimes, and quarters—to pay the expenses of representatives here, are unable to obtain a contract for one overcoat or able to earn \$1 in defense industry. If these 2 contracts upon which it was low bidder had been given to this company it would have commenced production within 30 days and employed up to 500 of these unemployed Negroes, thereby saving the taxpayers thousands of dollars which necessarily will be expended to feed and care for those who qualify for N. Y. A., and W. P. A., and relief.

Mr. Chairman, on February 21, 1942, the Cleveland Call Post had the following editorial which I want to read:

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

No nation combatting the increasing threat of totalitarianism can afford arbitrarily to exclude large segments of its population from its defense industries. Even more important is it for us to strengthen our unity and morale by refuting at home the very theories which we are fighting abroad.

Our Government cannot countenance continued discrimination against American citizens in defense production. Industry must take the initiative in opening the doors of employment to all loyal and qualified workers, regardless of race, national origin, religion, or color. American workers, both organized and unorganized, must be prepared to welcome the

general and much-needed employment of fellow workers of all racial and nationality origins in defense industries.

In the present emergency it is imperative that we deal effectively and speedily with this problem. I shall expect the Office of Production Management to take immediate steps to facilitate the full utilization of our productive manpower.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

I conclude by saying, "Mr. President, both the Office of Production Management and the War Production Board have refused to act in the Toledo situation. It is up to you."

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, first I want to briefly speak of the Soil Conservation Service. In the Soil Conservation Service program they make a soil-conservation survey, and in this connection they determine the kind of soil, the percent of the slope, the amount of erosion already taken place, the present use of the land. That is necessary in order to know what plan or procedure to follow to prevent further erosion.

Second, the soil-conservation plan is the control of erosion and increased production. I want you gentlemen to bear in mind that the Soil Conservation Service is one of the most important items in our program, because of the increased production resulting from the program.

Third, the establishment of the soil-conservation practice, which includes running terraces, contour of the soil, and the strip planning.

Fourth, advising with the farmers relative to maintenance.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman in regard to this vital program. We must not in this war, through neglect, repeat the awful mistake of the other war with reference to our soil resources.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. MURDOCK, you are absolutely correct in your conclusions. Coming from Oklahoma—a Plains State, like yours—I can readily understand your problems since they are similar to mine. Now, another item under consideration is the Farm Security Administration.

I will not dwell on these other agricultural agencies. It seems the appropriations will go through without too much trouble, but the Farm Security Administration is receiving considerable criticism. It is like a man who has 10 children. Because of the fact that one of the children becomes slightly wayward is no excuse or reason to condemn the other nine. By reason of the fact that this one child does only one bad thing is no reason to condemn the child. I say to you that the Farm Security Administration has done a splendid job in the majority of the fields. I personally know what the Farm Security Administration is doing in Oklahoma and Texas. I personally made a trip to Dallas and Fort Worth to see what the Farm Security Administration and the Soil Conservation Service were doing. I did

the same in Oklahoma. I have examined their records. I am a pretty good auditor, myself, as well as having spent 18 years on a farm. I tell you that the Farm Security Administration is taking care of the little farmer. I ran for Congress three times before I was elected. I talked to these poor people. I ate with them. I paid my 3 cents and my nickel for the school lunches, cooked from products furnished in connection with the food-stamp plan. I know what the small farmers are doing, and I tell you that today, of all times, we need to take care of the Farm Security Administration and the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentlemen from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have heard the same criticism made against the experimental work done by the Farm Security Administration, in the field as well as on the floor of this House. I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I have recently received letters from some of the ablest men of my State, men of affairs, presidents of colleges and universities, and businessmen, sanctioning the work that has been done by the Farm Security Administration in Arizona.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his valuable contribution. May I state to you Congressmen that through my association with the gentleman from Arizona not only on the floor of the House but in our committee work on the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation I have learned to highly respect his decisions and efforts in behalf of the tillers of the soil. The gentleman from Arizona has proven himself to be one of the farmers' best friends in Congress.

I wish to call your attention to page 13 of the newspaper PM of Monday, March 2, 1942. Not only do the farmers and businessmen endorse the Farm Security Administration, but I call to the attention of you Congressmen, who represent the labor leaders, to notice this headline which reads as follows:

MURRAY URGES SUPPORT OF THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, rallied to the support of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. Chairman, during the past year farm security has been preparing for an all-out mobilization of the efforts of low-income farm families to contribute fully to the national defense, and more recently to the national war effort. The campaign has had a twofold objective: to enable small, low-income farmers without other sources of credit to produce vital war foods for lend-lease and domestic purposes, and to help them produce plenty of good food for their own use and hence reduce their consumption of war foods on the Nation's markets. During the months since Pearl Harbor the food-for-victory production drive has been intensified, but that earlier efforts along these lines have already borne fruit is demonstrated by a recently completed survey.

This survey shows that the 3,558 families in the Seventh Oklahoma Congress-

sional District who held active standard rural rehabilitation loans last year increased the average value of food and other goods produced for home use by 122 percent, or from \$190 worth before acceptance on the F. S. A. program to \$231 in 1941. Much of the increase in food production was in foods vitally needed in the war program. For example, the average family in the district produced 200 more gallons of milk for home use in 1941 than they did before coming into the F. S. A. program. Their total milk-production increase, including that sold was, of course, considerably higher. Likewise, these families raised and consumed at home 90 percent more poultry, game, meat, and fish. Other produce for home use included 9 gallons of lard per family, 166 dozens of eggs, and 351 cans of fruits and vegetables put up for the winter. By thus raising for home consumption these nutritious foods these farm people were not only putting themselves in shape to meet the strain of war but were also relieving the Nation's wartime food markets of a substantial part of their demands for food.

In the Seventh District of Oklahoma 3,553 families were actively receiving F. S. A. rehabilitation aid last year. Before they received their loans these families, whose incomes at the time averaged only \$577, had been on or near the relief level. In 1941 the survey showed that they earned a net income of \$1,321, an increase by 129 percent. At the same time, these families were enabled to raise their net worth—over and above all debts, including their obligations to the Government—from \$1,029 before receiving F. S. A. assistance, to \$2,030 at the close of the 1941 crop year. This represents a gain of 97 percent.

Farm Security rehabilitation aid, as in times past, consisted mainly of small loans for seed, feed, fertilizer, and other necessary farm supplies, together with advice and assistance to help borrowers operate their farms more efficiently. The rehabilitation program continued to be practically self-liquidating. At the end of 1941 funds amounting to \$5,628,026 had been advanced to farmers in the Seventh District for rehabilitation loans. Although much of this money does not fall due for 4 or 5 years, \$2,452,573 in principal and \$259,395 in interest has already been paid back into the Federal Treasury.

To all debt-burdened farmers, whether or not they are rehabilitation borrowers, Farm Security has offered another service. Local farm debt adjustment committees help farmers and their creditors arrange a friendly adjustment of debts. This service is mutually beneficial because not only does it often save the farmer from foreclosure, but, at the same time, it helps creditors get substantial payments on what might otherwise have been bad debts. Last year debt reductions amounting to \$844,009 were made in the Seventh Congressional District. This represents a scale-down of 17.9 from a total prior indebtedness of \$4,708,314. As a direct result of these adjustments, \$61,346 in back taxes has been paid to local governmental agencies.

In addition to the rural rehabilitation program, Farm Security has been making a limited number of loans to families to enable them to buy farms of their own. A total of 175 Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant loans have been made in the seventh district. These loans have averaged \$7,751. These 175 families, secure on their own farms for the first time, now have the incentive to work at top speed for the food-for-victory program.

The rural rehabilitation program in Oklahoma has reached a total in excess of 86,000 low-income farm families since its inception, through standard rehabilitation loans and grants. Currently, over 22,000 families have active rehabilitation loans outstanding and loans have been processed to the limit of funds available at this time. The figures above, of course, do not include the hundreds of loans made to aid in establishing small cooperative enterprises for the benefit of all families in certain communities—for items such as purebred sires, peanut threshers, and the like.

The repayment record of these families is impressive. For example, rehabilitation loan borrowers repaid above 90 percent of their maturing installments during the fiscal year 1940-41, and current review of records gives definite assurance that a still higher percentage of maturities will be repaid within the present fiscal year—this in spite of the seasonal handicaps with which you are familiar.

Cumulatively, approximately 55 percent of all such funds advanced have been repaid, although the repayment period of the loans ranges up to 10 years.

Tenant purchase loans have been extended to over 900 families under authorization of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Of the families receiving tenant purchase loans, 99½ percent have met every matured installment.

As of February 9, 1942, there has been launched a program of special loans under the title of "Food-for-Freedom" loans, designed to make a very substantial contribution to the Nation's war effort through an intensified drive to get the maximum increase in production of all vital food commodities. Principal among these items are: Pork, beef—increased slaughter—poultry and poultry products, dairy products—surplus for condensery use and for cheese—oil-producing crops, and all types of vegetables for home use and for commercial use in certain areas.

In such loans F. S. A. employees will operate in the closest cooperation with local and State war boards, on all of which we have present active membership. It will be our purpose under this program, working through the war boards and in cooperation with all other existing agricultural agencies, to assist any family having suitable land resources under its control to obtain the maximum production of food essentials from such land and the producing livestock it will support; to aid these families in placing surplus production on the market most advantageous to the Nation in war; and to conserve all the production needed for the absolute well-being of each family;

provided, of course, that the required financial assistance cannot be made available through any other agency or establishment and the integrity of the individual applicant is favorably reported by established committees.

On the basis of current survey, it is evident that a minimum of 10,000 of these loans—all less than \$500—will be required in order to reach the production goals established by War Board recommendation. Our entire organization is geared now to do this job efficiently and conservatively, and no effort is to be spared throughout the year in work to guarantee the production and proper use of the production of these families.

Under the "food for freedom" program loans will also be made to organized youth clubs such as F. F. A., 4-H, and others for the same type of production purposes.

I take considerable pride in the fact that the 409 F. S. A. employees in Oklahoma are 100 percent in their purchases of Defense bonds and stamps and Red Cross pledges. We feel that this spirit reflects the thoroughly wholesome attitude which must accompany their work in building up and supporting the morale of a group of farm families, which, without doubt, will be among the first to feel the effects of the more serious war sacrifices we have cause to expect.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

PRODUCTION LEGISLATION—EVENTUALLY, WHY NOT NOW?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with the advertisement carried by a national flour-milling company some years ago: "Eventually, why not now?" Remember that one?

Listen to these words:

If a just and durable peace is to be attained or even if all of us are merely to save our own skins, there is one thought for us here at home to keep uppermost, the fulfillment of our special task of production—uninterrupted production.

I stress that word "uninterrupted."

Those are the words of President Roosevelt on February 23, 1942.

Then on the 27th, 4 days later, when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] proposed amendments to the then pending bill which some of us thought might tend to give us uninterrupted production, the House by a vote of 226 to 62 turned down those amendments.

I remember the arguments. One ran something like this: If you repeal the provisions of the wage-hour law, which puts a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours, you will increase union membership. What of it? Had not the administration been driving all the time to force men into the union? If that would have been the effect of the legislation, why did the administration oppose it? Strange to me it seemed when that argument was made by the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY and Mr. CASEY] and other spokesmen for the labor unions. According to their arguments, those amendments were going to benefit the unions and increase their membership, yet they spoke and voted against

them. I could not understand that. Nor if, as argued by several on the floor, the amendments would increase the power of the unions, drive unorganized workers into their ranks, why was it that both Mr. Green, president of the A. F. of L., and Mr. Murray, head of the C. I. O., opposed the adoption of those amendments? Amendments which so-called labor spokesmen on the floor said would benefit and increase the power of the unions?

Then another gentleman made the argument, and I will quote so I be not mistaken about it, he said:

Until this Congress shall by legislation recapture from those corporations which by their own financial statements and admissions before congressional committees, are making huge and tremendous profits out of this war effort I am not going to begin to economize by taking time and a half away from their employees.

That is an odd argument to me. Just because I steal a chicken you are going to take a turkey does not make sense now, does it? What we should, of course, do if the corporations are making these exorbitant profits—and one of them, I understand, the Todd Shipbuilding Co., offered to refund them—is to take those profits away from them; and since I have had a slant in the papers at this proposed new tax bill, I am not worrying very much about anyone's excess profits.

Here is the thought: Ultimately we are going to get around where this House will adopt some legislation which will give us production, we are going to get to the point where we shall be forced because of public sentiment to adopt such proposals as the Smith amendments would have written into law the other day, where a man who wants to work 48, 50 hours, or 55 I think is the maximum of efficiency work, on a national defense program—where that man will be permitted to do it without being required to demand and receive from his employer pay and a half for overtime or double pay for holidays.

As the law stands today, and we have refused to change it—as the law stands today, every employer in these industries who permits the father or the brother of a man serving at the front to work more than a certain number of hours without paying him pay and a half is liable to criminal prosecution. Is not that an absurdity?

I think it was day before yesterday that the local papers carried the statement by Donald Nelson, in charge of production, that we were now 25 percent below our capacity for production. Mr. Nelson did not say that the managers of these plants were inefficient. He made no such charge, and he cannot truthfully make such a charge. He said that we were 25 percent below the capacity of the plants, and we are losing that 25 percent because of these interruptions in our factories, and these interruptions come from all kinds of causes, none of which justifies either a strike or a slow-down.

I will insert in my remarks, when I get permission of the House, some editorials which show the trend of sentiment.

Here is one from the New York edition of the Daily News of February 26. It first

quotes the words of President Roosevelt which were given you at the beginning of this talk and then proceeds:

STRIKES AS USUAL

Right after Pearl Harbor, representatives of organized labor conferred with the President at the White House and promised an irreducible minimum of strikes and other labor troubles, so far as labor should be concerned, for the duration of the war.

Now, 11½ weeks after Pearl Harbor, we seem to be getting back to strikes as usual, meaning strikes as in the good old days before Pearl Harbor.

Enemy submarines are sinking tanker after tanker off our Atlantic coast. One enemy submarine Monday evening peppered a Pacific coast oil plant with shells. We need all the destroyers we can round up to fight these menaces to Allied oil lines, supply lines, troop transports.

Out on the Pacific coast, at the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s San Pedro, Calif., shipyards, a peculiar kind of strike is going on. The yards are building \$81,000,000 worth of destroyers. The Government has asked the company to operate 24 hours a day 7 days a week. The company has put on two 10-hour shifts a day, pending, as we understand it, the finding of enough labor to run three 8-hour shifts.

But the Congress of Industrial Organizations union leaders in charge of the 5,000 workers at the yards will have none of that. The workers are putting in 8 hours per shift, then walking off the job for the remaining two. Loss: 20,000 man-hours per day of work on these destroyers.

At Cleveland, the Congress of Industrial Organizations Mine, Mill, and Smelters Union called a 1-day strike against a labor board order, in the plants of the Monarch Aluminum Manufacturing Co., now working on aluminum bomb and aircraft parts. Aircraft companies making bomber and fighter planes are pleading for faster delivery of these and related parts. But the Congress of Industrial Organizations union struck because the labor board last September ordered the Monarch Co. to deal with another union.

These are only two samples of what is going on in some of the war industries. The situation promises to get worse if something isn't done to stop it.

PATIENCE IS WEARING THIN

Naturally, all sorts of excited proposals are being advanced in Congress.

There are suggestions that workers be declared into some sort of industrial branch of the Army; that strikes and lock-outs be forbidden on pain of fines and jail terms; that jurisdictional strikes be made crimes; and so on and so forth.

Though it is pretty late in the day, it looks as if it is still too early to go to extremes. The bulk of war-industry workers are still on the job, exerting their full efforts to out-produce the Axis, and anxious to keep answering the President's call for "production, uninterrupted production."

But to a few obtusely ambitious labor leaders and their more gullible followers this tip would seem to be in order:

The American people don't have to tolerate these production stoppages forever. From what we can observe of the way most Americans feel about them, they are just about fed up.

That may be unkind, unjust, and inconsiderate. But it is the way more and more people are feeling every day.

It may be false logic, too, for a lot of Americans to reflect that their boys have been drafted into the Army at \$21 a month base pay, with no right to strike, while labor retains the right to strike even in plants supplying weapons to enable those boys to defend their country and their own lives. But more and more Americans are thinking that way, as more and more of their boys are jerked into the Army.

The present President has been the best friend labor ever had in the White House. In view of his political debts to labor, it is a safe bet that he is not going to do anything to injure labor, unless forced to it by the necessities of the war.

Labor, then, would seem to be well advised to go along with the President and rebuff any of its leaders who may try to persuade workers to jim the war effort somehow by pulling a strike somewhere. Disputes had better be referred to arbitration or mediation, and production kept up, no matter how long the decisions may be delayed.

Americans by and large can be awfully mean hombres when their patience wears out.

From an editorial of the News-Palladium, published at Benton Harbor, Mich., I quote the following paragraph:

Speaking of traitors, saboteurs, and fifth columnists, those strikers who are causing industrial stoppages while our boys are dying on the front lines, had better resist forthwith from their selfishness and unpatriotic greed if they are to escape branding as enemies of the country. These obstructionists are a minority and not representative of the vast majority of loyal American workers, but they are a dangerous minority inviting the wrath of a people whose patience with their racketeering is at an end.

Reaching now down into the South, take this one from the Vernon Daily Record, published at Vernon, Tex.:

WHO NEEDS TO BECOME AROUSED?

Congressman HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Dallas, the other day took the floor of the House and made a speech urging the people of the country to become aroused at the seriousness of the war situation. Other speeches, similar in content and purpose, are being made by Congressmen, Senators, and officials in the executive department.

But one cannot avoid wondering what has created the impression in Washington that the people of the country are not aroused. In view of what has been happening there is reason to suspect that those who complain about low civilian morale are using this procedure to cover up their own failures. It is a common human weakness to charge others with responsibility for one's own negligence.

A few citations might be in order.

The people back home were not responsible for failure to fortify Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippines.

The people back home were not to blame for strikes tying up vital airplane production which might have saved Manila and Singapore.

The people back home are not to blame for the failure to accept Henry Ford's offer of more than 18 months ago to be building 1,000 fighter planes per day within 6 months from the time he was given the order to go ahead. That much production for the past year would have saved all of the Far Eastern battle area for the Allies.

The people back home are not responsible for the bull-headed indifference of Army and Navy officers which contributed to the disaster of Pearl Harbor.

The people back home are not responsible for the failure to write an antistrike law which would put an end to strikes in war industries.

The people back home are not responsible for making a plaything of civilian defense, nor are they responsible for the petty squabbles in Washington as to which department or bureau will have charge of a particular job.

As a matter of fact, the people have responded to every call while Congress twiddled its collective thumbs and did nothing to correct the conditions cited in the preceding paragraphs. The great white fathers in Washington will have nothing to complain

about so far as civilian morale is concerned if they will devote their energies to meeting their own responsibility instead of lecturing the people back home. Action and results, rather than speeches from self-appointed pep leaders, are all that civilian morale needs.

Then here is another one from the News right here in Washington, expressing the farmer's idea of the situation:

AS A FARMER SEES IT

A farmer friend writes:

"Your paper is supporting President Roosevelt in his effort to hold farm prices down by marketing Government-held surpluses. You and the President ought to understand why so many farmers feel they are being treated unjustly.

"It is largely because Mr. Roosevelt continues to pamper organized labor as if it were a spoiled child.

"Higher farm prices would mean higher cost of food. That's true. But higher wages add to the cost of everything, including machinery and fertilizer, that farmers must buy. Yet the Government's policy seems to be that unions must get wage increases whenever they make demands, as the price of not striking against national safety. Mr. Roosevelt does not fight for stabilization of wages, even for highly paid workers in war industries, who already have far more 'parity' than the farmers ever hope to get.

"The farmer has no 40-hour-week law. He must put in longer, harder hours than ever, because his sons are being drafted and his hired men are being lured away to easier, better-paid jobs in war plants. He'll do the best he can to produce food and fiber to win the war, and he won't ask premium pay for overtime.

"You say, and it's true, that the Government acquired the surpluses to help agriculture out of depression. But isn't the same thing true of labor's 40-hour-week laws? They were a depression measure, too, designed to make jobs for surplus workers. If agriculture must give up a prop for its prices, now that times have changed, why should labor keep a similar prop?

"But Mr. Roosevelt seems to think that labor must have the 40-hour week right through the war, even though workers instead of jobs are getting scarce now and even though time-and-a-half pay for work beyond 40 hours a week speeds up the growth of the war bill which all of us, farmers included, will have to pay. Automobile-plant labor is even demanding time-and-a-half wages for Saturdays and double time for Sundays when work on those days is part of a 40-hour week. And Mr. Roosevelt's War Labor Board apparently is afraid to rule that such a demand is just plain damn nonsense, which is how it looks to farmers.

"This is a time, the President says, when everybody must stop demanding special advantages. Hurrah for that! But we farmers don't like the idea that his words apply only to us and not to labor. Mr. Roosevelt's troubles with the so-called farm bloc would end in a hurry if he would be equally firm with the labor bloc and if he would make it plain that he expects union members to do their fair share of the sacrificing."

Our farmer friend, it seems to us, has said a mouthful.

Then from another Washington paper get this one:

LABOR HOLDS BACK

In his address to the Nation President Roosevelt said that "we can lose this war only if we slow up our effort or if we waste our ammunition sniping at each other." The force of that warning has evidently been lost on some union leaders. For strikes and labor disturbances that are retarding production on war contracts continue to occur

in all parts of the country. At the yards of the Bethlehem Steel Co., in San Pedro, Calif., for example, Congress of Industrial Organizations workers refused to stay on the job over 8 hours, even at higher rates of pay for overtime, with bonuses attached.

The reprimand administered by the American Federation of Labor Musicians' Union to a band leader for giving free concerts at an Army post provides another striking instance of labor's noncooperative attitude. The incident itself seems petty, but its implications are very serious. For it reveals a rather typical determination on the part of the union's leaders to cling to protective rules that may be justified in times of peace but are utterly unsuited to the conditions of war.

With evidence accumulating to show that organized labor will not of its own initiative make the sacrifices required if the war is to be won on the production front, it is up to Congress to act without further delay. One of the most formidable barriers to an all-out production effort is the Federal wage-hour law establishing a 40-hour standard working week. So long as that legislation remains on the statute books Congress of Industrial Organizations leaders who insist upon retention of the 8-hour day and 40-hour week will be well armored against hostile criticism. Yet, under present conditions, it is dangerous folly to retain a law that was originally designed to spread employment by compelling employers to pay greatly increased rates for overtime. Today we are faced by labor shortages which make it essential to lengthen the working day as a means of relieving the drain upon our inadequate labor reserves.

The fact is, as Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON points out, that "we cannot out-produce the Axis Powers on a 40-hour week, and it is absurd to penalize an employer willing to step up production by means of a longer workweek." Moreover, even if the employer is ready to pay the penalty rates and the employee is willing to work overtime, the effect of the higher rates of overtime pay is inflationary—adding unnecessarily to the cost of the war program and tending to raise living costs.

So the movement in the House to force suspension of the 40-hour week for the duration of the war should be encouraged. The continuance of labor disturbances and strikes has emphasized the need for such action and increased the chances for success of the suspension proposal. Thereafter, if interruptions of work continue, drastic measures designed to prevent strikes in war industries will assuredly follow. Labor has been given ample warning.

The point I am trying to make here today is that the people are demanding, and some day their demand is going to be answered, that we do away during this period of the war with this restriction on the right of patriotic men to work as many hours as they wish for any price they are willing to accept for the defense of their country. There is many and many a man and woman who has a relative in the armed service who would be glad, who is willing, to work on a Sunday and do it without extra compensation or compensation of any kind, in order to help that other member of the family who is on the fighting front.

These strikes occur for all sorts of reasons, or for no reason at all. Let me just read you this editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 24:

A SENSELESS WAR-WORK STOPPAGE

Has there been a more unjustified stoppage of work anywhere in the country since the

beginning of the war emergency than that which cost a precious day at the Granite City plant of the American Steel Foundries?

It seems scarcely possible, so utterly without basis was the suspension yesterday of work on cast armor for Army tanks and gun mounts for the Navy.

What was the difference between the workers and their employer? There was none.

Was it, then, a jurisdictional dispute between rival unions for the right to represent the workers? No; not even that thoroughly discredited issue was involved.

That picket line of 100 men at the plant meant merely that the Congress of Industrial Organizations Steel Workers' Organizing Committee was collecting union dues. Some 75 workers refused to pay up or were unable to pay, and so the union did the brave, strong thing of picketing the plant.

The executive in charge of the foundry said that the pickets, in barring the door to employees scattered through the plant, not only caused a shutdown but also violated the union contract which provides that there shall be no intimidation or coercion of employees into union membership. The union's subdistrict director shifts the blame to the company; he says it locked out its employees in an effort to take advantage of its defense work as a protest against the union's method of collecting dues.

What counts is that a mass picket line was set up at a war-production foundry to collect dues from some union members who didn't want to pay any, and a shutdown followed.

On the Bataan Peninsula brave soldiers of Douglas MacArthur are giving their lives for liberty and the right to work as freemen, not slaves. And at Granite City the Congress of Industrial Organizations collects delinquent dues with mass picketing, and production for vital war equipment comes to a dead stop for a day.

It would be incredible if it hadn't happened.

Here is what that strike was about. A picket line was set up at a war production foundry to collect dues from some union members who did not want to pay or who could not pay their union dues. What do you think about that? Here is a case of shutting down a defense plant and using the stoppage of work so that a collection agency might operate.

I notice the gentleman from northern Michigan [Mr. Hook] is on the floor. He made a statement on the 17th of February 1942—RECORD, page 1376—that there have been no strikes; that there were no strikes. Now, just listen to this. Here is the A. P. dispatch under date of March 1 from the New York Times. Quoting:

MANUFACTURERS REPORT RISE IN STRIKES

NEW YORK, March 1.—The National Association of Manufacturers said tonight that the number of strikes in war-production plants during February increased 77 percent over January, involved 357 percent more workers, and resulted in 206 percent more man-hours lost than in the preceding month.

The association said its statement was based on compilations of strikes reported in metropolitan newspapers and papers in principal industrial centers, and did not attempt to cover every strike action.

In February, the association asserted, men involved in war industry strikes totaled 70,905, compared to 15,512 in January, and the number of strikes rose from 43 to 76, with man-hours lost increasing from 66,976 in January to 2,028,824.

The majority of the defense plant strikes, the association declared, had involved Congress of Industrial Organizations local

unions, and six were said to be jurisdictional disputes between the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor, with the remainder involving independent unions.

Many of the strikes, the association said, could be described as "critical" and had delayed production of such basic war products as bomber parts, antiaircraft guns, ships and ship parts, armor plate, machine tools, and dies.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I do not know how authentic the figures are, but we do know that there are those who are not connected with unions bringing about some of these strikes and trying to blame them on to the unions. There are activities going around the country that have developed into strikes, un-American, subversive activities, caused by foreign agents, and the blame is attempted to be laid on union organizations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no information substantiating the gentleman's statement. If accurate the answer is contained in the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES] today when he said that when his committee attempted to get at those Communists in the ranks of the C. I. O. the C. I. O. refused to help or permit it. Will the gentleman cite me one instance where there has been a strike or a stoppage of work in any factory that was caused by someone not connected with the union?

Mr. HOOK. I would like to have the gentleman name some of them where union officials have condoned strikes since Pearl Harbor. In fact, they have come out and announced they were not authorized strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman made an assertion that strikes were caused by those not connected with unions, who tried to blame those strikes on the unions. He further said that there were activities going around the country that have developed into strikes—un-American, subversive activities—caused by foreign agents, and the blame is attempted to be laid on union organizations.

I asked him to name a strike so caused. The gentleman now replies by asking me another question. He has failed to answer my question, so I assume that he cannot name such a strike as he described. Does the gentleman mean that all the strikes which have occurred since Pearl Harbor were wildcat strikes?

Mr. HOOK. No authorized strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Unauthorized strikes?

Mr. HOOK. Absolutely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about this strike that the Post-Dispatch referred to called for the purpose of collecting dues? That was a union strike by the C. I. O. Steel Workers Organizing Committee to collect union dues.

Mr. HOOK. What union?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not the name of the union.

Mr. HOOK. Was it the Nazi Bund?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. I do not understand they have a union. Does the gen-

tleman claim the Nazi Bund belongs to the C. I. O.?

Mr. HOOK. I certainly do not. You ought to know who the Nazi Bund belongs to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, my name happens to be HOFFMAN, and I have never changed my name. That is the name I was born with.

Mr. HOOK. Any Member of Congress ought to know what the Nazi Bund is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I may say, too, I am a Pennsylvania Dutchman, not a German.

One other thing. You are all familiar with this decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court a couple of days ago. This decision holds that, insofar as Federal legislation goes, a union man can climb on a truck and by force at the point of a gun compel the truck driver or the owner or employee to pay \$8 in one case and \$9 in another for driving through a certain district in New York City.

Here is what an editorial in the Washington Daily News had to say on that subject:

"COMMON LAW ROBBERY"

The cost of living in New York City (and in many other cities) is unjustly increased by a labor-union racket which the United States Supreme Court has just held to be beyond the reach of Federal law.

Suppose you own a truck and want to deliver a load of food into New York. You can't do it until you pay \$9.42 to Local 807 of the American Federation of Labor Teamsters Union, this representing a day's wages for a union driver. You don't want or need to hire a union driver, but you have to pay for him anyway.

This is just what Chief Justice Stone called it in a dissenting opinion—"common-law robbery." And, of course, the tribute thus extorted by the union is added to the cost of food and other commodities trucked into the city, and so finally is paid by the people of New York.

Thurman Arnold, the trust-busting Assistant Attorney General, undertook to prosecute Local 807 and 26 of its members under the Federal antiracketeering law. He convicted them, but the convictions were set aside by a circuit court, and the Supreme Court has now agreed with the circuit court.

But, as Justice Byrnes points out, Congress could change the law. And it should.

President Roosevelt is making a good fight to save consumers a billion dollars a year by preventing unjustified increases in farm prices. This same amount—a billion a year—is what the protected union rackets, such as this one in New York, cost American consumers, according to the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. That billion, also, should be saved. And the President, by ending administration opposition to bills which have been held up in Congress for many months, could insure that it will be saved.

Today's Washington Star, speaking editorially, had this to say about the same subject. I quote but part of the editorial:

RACKETEERING DECISION

The recent decision by the Supreme Court in a New York racketeering case should come as a distinct and decidedly unpleasant shock to a good many Americans.

The case involved some of the activities of the New York local of the American Federation of Labor Teamsters' Union. Certain members of the union were convicted of violating the so-called anti-racketeering act, the evidence showing that they lay in wait for

trucks coming into New York from New Jersey, forced their way onto the trucks, and by beating or threatening to beat the drivers procured payments to themselves from the drivers or the employers of the drivers of sums of money equivalent to the union scale for a day's work. In some instances the union members assisted or offered to assist in unloading the trucks; in others they simply disappeared as soon as the money was paid without rendering or offering to render any service.

In holding that these defendants were improperly convicted under the law, the majority opinion covers a great deal of ground and its reasoning is often difficult to follow.

The reasoning of the majority brought from Chief Justice Stone a sharply worded dissent. But, under these circumstances, there is small comfort to be derived from a dissenting opinion, I would point out. The blunt fact is that the majority of the Court, through an interpretation of the intent of Congress, has made it extremely difficult for the Department of Justice to use this law to reach any of the labor racketeers whose reprehensible activities add millions of dollars yearly to a bill which ultimately must be paid by the public. The one hope of relief lies in an aroused public opinion which will bring the enactment of legislation aimed expressly at these labor activities, and which will be so explicitly worded that it cannot be subject to any other interpretation.

The necessity for legislation by this Congress is clearly indicated by this decision and by the failure of local authorities to give protection to our citizens.

The same brand of robbery prevails in the city of Detroit. When I want to take a truckload of apples over to Detroit and unload it at the warehouse, I have to pay \$25 unless I drive the truck myself. My boy cannot drive it, the man on the farm cannot drive it, even my wife could not drive that truck through there unless she came across with \$25. That is in violation of the State law, and it is in violation of our rights, but the unions have gained so much power that they are able to force this highway robbery on the people and get away with it. Now comes the Supreme Court and it tells us that under this act which we passed here to stop racketeering, that sort of a hold-up, if carried out by members of a union, is perfectly legal insofar as that Federal law is involved.

Mr. Chairman, it is up to Congress to amend that law. The lack of adequate legislation is our responsibility. So, too, is the failure of the executive department when that failure becomes chronic. Time and again whenever there is some little thing that is not right somewhere in the States, people come to the Congress and say, "We must have a Federal law. You must take the power away from the States." But every time folks come to the Congress to be protected against violence and against robbery, by members of these unions, we are told that this is not the time, this is not the place, the method sought to be used is not the proper one.

How many times has the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] proposed amendments that would assist the farmers and the honest people in the Nation to market their products? How many times have I offered such legislation?

How many times have the spokesmen for the unions told us, "Well, now, wait; today is not the day and this is not the proper bill to tack it on." I notice those who oppose our efforts never bring out a bill which would end this practice.

I am not advocating violence; I abhor violence in any form; but I say to you that if this thing keeps on, if you continue to refuse protection to peaceable citizens going about their lawful business, some day you are going to find the farmers putting the old shotgun or the pitchfork on to their trucks, driving through the city streets, then what have you? You have civil strife right there. And right there it becomes the duty of the Federal Government to protect the citizen.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think that is the right thing to say.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is not making the speech; that is the only difficulty.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not mean to criticize.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let me have the question.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman think that bringing up this subject continually, as he has been doing, in view of the fact the House voted the way it did the other day when the Smith amendment was up for consideration, will tend at all toward national unity in this country?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, I refuse to yield further. The gentleman has asked his question. If the gentleman thinks that those fellows in Detroit can continue as they have, by the use of firearms, by the use of blackjacks and clubs, and by the use of goon squads, with their beating, their maiming of inoffensive farmers driving their own trucks into Detroit, he is mistaken, or Detroit has ceased to be a city of law and order. If the gentleman will come over to my office, I will show him the picture of five of these Detroit fellows, cowards all, beating up one helpless man, and I will also produce the membership cards in the Communist Party of at least two of them. If the gentleman thinks that they are going to indefinitely keep the farmers out of Detroit with their food products, then he is mistaken.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has not answered my question at all. He is talking all around the ring.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will answer the gentleman's question. I say, you are never going to get unity as long as you advocate that one group, the Communists, the C. I. O., the A. F. of L. Teamsters, can prevent the people's use of the streets or of the highways of my State.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman cannot put those words in my mouth, either.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman wanted to know if I was advocating unity. I tell you we are not always going to submit to the blackjacking, the bludgeoning of our people by the gangsters of Detroit; that is what we are not going to do.

Now that a sheriff of your county, a prosecutor of your county, a mayor and several of your city officials, have been convicted and sentenced to prison, it may be that the people of Detroit will awaken and that the citizens of the State, the farmers of the State, will be given protection in their efforts to feed the people of Detroit.

It may be that some day Michigan will elect a governor who will have courage enough to curb the gangsters of Detroit, restore law and order and common decency to that city.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan the remaining time on this side.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that labor unions in the city of Detroit exact the sum of \$25 from farmers seeking to sell their produce in the city?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right; that is the teamsters' union, A. F. of L.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the State of Michigan or the city of Detroit doing to break up that practice?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not one thing.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the matter with the local authorities?

Mr. HOFFMAN. They are under the control of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. politicians. Let me tell you, when the State police in Detroit—and I saw those picket lines myself on the 2nd and 3rd day of April 1941—

Mr. RABAUT. I have never heard it before in my whole life.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are a lot of things, then, that the gentleman has not heard, and I have due respect for the gentleman, too, and I admire him; but it is strange to me that he does not know things that are a matter of common report, of common knowledge, in the city of Detroit. I think on reflection he will find that he knows much about violence in Detroit.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. When the State police went down on the picket line they had to lay aside their weapons before they went out there on that particular occasion.

Mr. COOLEY. Why was that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Because there was to be no violence; because the pickets were to have a monopoly of head-cracking. Are you not familiar with the 1937 strikes in Flint, where the Governor himself called out the State troops to protect the C. I. O. from the populace, from the people, when it had possession of the plants, when it had driven men and women from their jobs?

Oh, I say to the gentleman who just asked me a question a while ago, that strike was ended on the 9th day of June 1937, and it was ended because Governor Murphy was told by the citizens of Flint that the citizens of Flint were preparing to arm themselves to retake possession of those factories.

I do not advocate violence, but I do say this, that you cannot have a monop-

oly of these beatings and these killings. You just cannot have it. If you think the farmers and the people outside the cities are going to submit to this gangster rule, then you have another guess coming. You are just mistaken about it, Louie. You cannot drive me out of the city of Detroit any more than I can drive you off the highway that runs through my home town.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I know the gentleman does not want to tie to me the fact that there are gangster killings and things of that kind.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly, I do not.

Mr. RABAUT. Because I am not that type of man and would never condone it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And everybody knows that. I am not criticizing you in any way. I want this House to pass needed legislation.

Mr. RABAUT. But I want to say this to the gentleman. The gentleman is talking about the Flint strike. He has brought it up here before. The gentleman cannot name one great industrialist in the whole of Michigan that took it out on Murphy for his policies during those strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right, and the reason they did not apply right here. When these fellows come down here for orders, they are so intimidated, they are so fearful that they might lose a business contract or a dollar, that they do not stand up for their rights. And what good would it do for them to criticize Murphy? The strike was over—they had felt the power of the Governor and the C. I. O.

Mr. RABAUT. No; they have praised him rather than criticized him, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There are some who lick the boots of those who kick them. Did the gentleman approve of the sit-down strikes?

Mr. RABAUT. We are not talking about the sit-down strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; of course, the gentleman does not want to talk about them.

Mr. RABAUT. I am talking about the gentleman's attack on Murphy. The gentleman just attacked Murphy again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure, I attacked Murphy. What did he do? He threw the weight of the State police back of the strikers, did he not, men who had driven honest American citizens from their jobs? Of course he did. Anybody who tries to justify that may do so.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think you can forget those former troubles; you have a much more serious proposition in Detroit now. You have a race riot over there. They are trying to put a lot of Negroes out in the white section of the town. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the disturbance that is really wrecking the State of Michigan today?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I know it only through the newspapers. The gentleman is right that we might forget those strikes if the officers would enforce the law but until we are given some semblance of justice, some protection, I will never quit. I am willing to forget the violence except as it is continued.

In further answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] I quote here an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday which bears on this whole situation. It is as follows:

RIOTING IN DETROIT

Fourteen persons were injured, including 5 policemen, in a riot in Detroit on Saturday. At a cost of a million dollars the Government had built some 200 dwellings for defense workers. The project had been intended originally for Negroes, but protests from white residents of the neighborhood resulted some time ago in the announcement that the houses would be occupied by whites. The Negroes then protested and the Government again changed its mind. When several Negro families sought to move into the new quarters on Saturday entrance to the project was barred by a picket line and the fighting and furniture smashing began.

The incident is an ugly one, discreditable to the Federal housing officials and more especially to the Government and people of Detroit. They were all in the wrong and in varying degrees they all bear a share of responsibility for the outrage.

The Detroit Free Press says "City officials generally view the racial controversy as the most serious threat to the peace of Detroit in many years, and that includes all the strikes of the last 10 years." Several weeks ago Mayor Jeffries used much the same language in saying, "It is by far the most serious thing in my administration."

What the officials apparently do not see is that the housing riot is itself the outgrowth of the labor disorders which were so generally tolerated in Michigan a few years ago. At that time public officials, taking their lead from President Roosevelt and Governor Murphy, refused to resist acts of mob violence. Factories were occupied and no serious effort was made to enforce orders of the Michigan courts to return the properties to their owners. At one moment the strikers in Lansing seized control of the statehouse itself, and were not opposed. Highways were blocked, interstate commerce on the railroads was interrupted, and nothing was done about it.

That was Michigan's education in mob violence and the lesson has apparently been well learned. Many people in Detroit seem to have reached the conclusion that the larger the mob the more praiseworthy its activities.

Self-anointed humanitarians throughout the country sympathized with the sit-down strikers and found excuses for their lawlessness. The rioters were said to be underprivileged and therefore entitled to adjust the balance in any way they could find. Cowardly public officials were praised for their calm acceptance of the disorders, as if the safeguarding of life and property were not the primary concern of all government and of State and local government in particular. Mr. Murphy was rewarded with an appointment to the Supreme Court.

Now the mob had turned against the least privileged group in America. That should have been expected. When the notion becomes current that the constituted authorities will not keep the peace, the victims of racial or religious prejudice, being in a minority, must expect the worst, particularly at such moments as this in Detroit when there is much unemployment resulting from the shut-down of the automobile factories.

That is the principal lesson to be derived from the disgraceful incident. A secondary

lesson is that if communities invite the Federal Government to build houses for the citizens, the wishes of the Federal bureaucracy and not of the communities will be followed.

But when the gentleman from Detroit, and I am not linking him up—

Mr. RABAUT. Grosse Point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Grosse Point; excuse me. I am not linking him up with these gangsters at all. We all know he is not that kind of a man. But what I cannot understand is why you Members of the majority who believe in religion, and in law and in enforcement of law, and in peace, and the rights of the American citizens do not vote that way when these questions come up in the House.

Mr. RABAUT. And add to those phrases one more, national unity.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and add unity. What kind of unity do you want? Do you want the kind that Murphy wanted?

Mr. RABAUT. I want any kind we can get. We need it now. The call for it is echoing in the valley for it comes from the mountaintops.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then you will join with me to give to every American citizen the right to work in a defense industry without being compelled to join a union. You will join with me in giving them the right to work 48 or 50 hours a week.

Mr. RABAUT. The House expressed itself on that this week. Why keep bringing it up?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Because when you have a truth like that and a principle at stake, you never want to quit until you have won. Do you want us to submit to gangster rule? Murphy asked us to submit to the goon squads. He asked us to give up our property, our personal liberty, our right to work, in order to avoid violence. Those are the very things we are now arming a million men to protect. I for one will never submit to gangsters, whether they be foreign or domestic, whether they be Hitler and his armed forces or Murray or Green and their goon squads.

Unity is all right, and we all want it, provided it does not require the surrender of our liberty to the lawless.

Mr. RABAUT. We have a leader in the White House—our President—with wartime powers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, lay it on his doorstep; I am not at this moment accusing him.

Mr. RABAUT. It is within his powers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why does he not do it? He has authority, and it is his duty to protect our workers, our farmers. Read section 5299 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. RABAUT. You will have to ask him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We are trying to lay it all on the President, but the President signed that pension bill, and you did not hear much criticism of him, though he would have benefited more than anyone else; but we caught Billy-be-damned for it, and we ran for cover, let me tell you, brother.

Mr. RABAUT. I did not file a bill to repeal it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did.

Mr. RABAUT. Do not say "we" ran for cover.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, bless your dear heart, when you fellows make a mistake I do my best to get you out of the hole every time. What I am trying to do now is to get you to repent and follow the sawdust trail and adopt some decent, respectable legislation that will restore to the American citizen a portion of his right to take part in the service of his country.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot resist.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman will admit that the great automotive industry in the United States has had the greatest productive ability of any industry in the world, and when they really want production, when they really want to turn out tanks and war munitions, they turn to that great industry, and they have rallied to their support and they are going ahead and they are going to give their limit. Now how do you suppose those tanks are rolling off the lines and how do you suppose they are tooling for the war effort, if the men in the plants are not doing it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, they are turning out a prodigious amount of material and if the union officers would forget business as usual we would get more. But then Nelson comes along and says they are 25 percent below production capacity. He ought to know.

Mr. HOOK. The reason for that is we need time for tools. You have got to have tools.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot yield now.

I will say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] that it is not lack of tools to which Mr. Nelson referred. His statement was that our production was 25 percent less than the capacity of our plants, and tools are included in the term "plants."

Refer back to the increase in slow-downs, stoppages, and strikes in the month of February over those in the month of January and you will find the true reason for the lack of production.

Not long ago this House gave the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. all that they asked by way of defeating amendments which would have curbed jurisdictional strikes, sympathetic strikes, strikes in defense plants. Since that time, we have had many stoppages of work; we have had many strikes, some of them wildcat strikes, some of them union strikes.

We have had the unions insistent that on this national defense work, if they work more than 40 hours per week, they be paid pay and a half or half as much again for every hour of overtime. They insist that, if they work on Sundays or holidays, they receive double pay—this when they know that our soldiers are on duty 24 hours a day for less per month than some union men receive for 1 day's service.

Yes; and added to all these demands, they insist that the American citizen, loyal and patriotic, eager to serve, shall not be permitted to work in defense of his country unless he first pays the union.

How a demand of that kind, how a policy of that kind, must delight the heart of Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss during the few minutes I have this afternoon the question of parity. I am not only disturbed, I am alarmed, over the false and misleading propaganda that has been spread over this country from one end to the other, indicating that the farmers, in asking for parity, are not patriotic in that they are trying to hog something during this emergency. I resent this propaganda. There is no class in America more patriotic than the farming class.

For 10 long years Democrats and Republicans alike have been preaching parity. The Republican platform and the Democratic platform alike contain declarations in favor of parity, and now, lo and behold, when the farmers are about to reach the goal at which we have been aiming for 10 long years, the propaganda goes out that if we reach that goal we are going to boost farm prices to such an extent we will bring about inflation. A greater piece of falsehood—and I make the statement advisedly—was never circulated. If you raise every farm product to parity, you will only increase the farm income some \$250,000,000. Will that bring about inflation? The idea is ridiculous. What I cannot understand is this: You can raise the wage scale and put millions of dollars of new money in the pockets of the laboring people, and no one hollers inflation. You permit the industrialists to make 200, 300, 500, yes, 1,500 percent and add millions to their coffers, and no one hollers inflation. But if you permit the farmer to receive what you have been telling him for the past 10 years is a fair price, out goes the hue and cry that he is hoggish. Listen; the farmers are paying 146 percent more for what they buy than they did during the base period from 1909 to 1914. No one seems to be complaining because the things the farmers buy have gone up 146 percent. Well, parity, in simple words, only guarantees to the farmer that when the things he buys go up there shall be a corresponding increase in the price of the things he sells. Now, if Mr. Henderson wants to be fair, why does he not crack down on the fellows who are charging the farmers 146 percent over the base-period prices? Why crack down on the farmers and let the 146 percenters play the sky for the limit?

Let me also call your attention to the fact that the farming population, while comprising one-third of our population, only receives one-tenth of our national income. As long as this remains true, there is no earthly way the farming class can bring about inflation.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. What does the gentleman say about the statement that

parity for the farmers will increase the cost of living about a billion dollars?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It is false. To bring farm prices up to parity should cause but very little, if any, advance in food prices. I want to further say that the rise in farm prices during the recent past does not justify the price the consumer is paying for food today. What happens? Down in my district, I think, we raise the best beef cattle in the world. We got about a cent less per pound for our heavy cattle in 1941 than we got in 1940, yet in spite of the fact that beef cattle were bringing 1 cent per pound more in 1940 than they brought in 1941, beef selling in the meat markets averaged around 10 cents per pound higher in 1941 than it did in 1940. Take wheat: When wheat went up around 20 cents per bushel, a loaf of bread went up 2 and 3 cents. There are 60 loaves to the bushel, so when the farmer got an advance of 20 cents per bushel the cost to the consumers, after the millers, processors, and retail merchants finished doctoring it up, was from \$1.50 to \$1.80 per bushel. The same is true all the way down the line. Yet someone is trying to create the impression that the farmers are responsible for the advance in the cost of living.

Now, I make this broad challenge: There is no justification for the great advance in the cost of food to the consumers. Farm prices have not caused the great advance, and farm prices, even if permitted to go to 110 percent of parity, would not be justification for such an advance. Mr. Henderson and the Secretary are working on the wrong folks. If they would pay a little more attention to the millers, canners, processors, brokers, and retail men and let the farmers rest for a spell they would render the consumers of this country a great service.

The farmers are not trying to dodge their responsibility in this war. They are willing to make sacrifices, any sacrifices necessary to win, but they rightly believe that the sacrifices necessary to win should be, as far as possible, equally distributed, and they resent, and rightfully resent, being charged up with the sins of others.

The argument was advanced the other day, and by those in authority, that we should permit some of the wheat and corn to be sold for stock and poultry feed and for the distillation of alcohol. Why? To keep the prices of poultry and stock feed and alcohol down. As to stock and poultry feed, let me give but one example. I wish I had time to really go into the matter. Take poultry feed: The cheapest of wheat would be put into poultry feed known as scratch. Well, I am advised the farmers would get a little over \$22 for the wheat going into a ton of scratch. Now, this feed is quoted in the Chicago market for from \$36.50 to \$38.50 and I understand is being sold by the retailers for around \$45 per ton. Now if wheat goes up to the parity price per bushel, is there any justification to increase the price of scratch to the consumer? A farmer from South Carolina told me today eggs were selling in his home town for 15 to 20 cents per dozen.

I phoned to one of the Washington grocery stores and was advised eggs were selling for 46 cents per dozen.

Oh, yes; the farmer gets charged up with \$45 feed for which he received \$22 and 46-cent eggs for which he received 20 cents, and seemingly those in authority are going a long way to make the charges stick. All I want is for the public to know the truth. And I am determined to give them the truth.

Now, as to corn for alcohol. Corn is bringing 76.6 cents per bushel. Parity price of corn is 93.7 cents per bushel. Now, what is the proposition with reference to corn? Why let the distillers have it for less than parity, so alcohol can be produced at the same price it can be produced from sugar? Why? Well, this is what they tell you. If the distillers have to pay parity, they will raise the price of sugar alcohol to the price of corn alcohol, and if we do not therefore lower the price of corn we will permit the distillers to reap an unjust profit. My answer: If Mr. Henderson can crack down on the farmers, why cannot he crack down on the distillers? Let these would-be farm experts answer that question to the satisfaction of the farmers and the public. Again I ask, Why take it out of the farmer? Why hold the farmer down and not hold down the distiller of corn alcohol?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I can answer that if the gentleman will permit. It is because for years they have played the farmer for a sucker. The football of political manipulators; the source of fortunes for middlemen and wholesalers and of salaries for department and bureau heads and jobs for lobbyists, the farmer—the honest-to-God man who earns his few dollars by sweat and blood and tears has been made the goat by this administration. It is not funny now that it is no joke. The bread basket producer of the world has no business to be pressed into poverty by a program such as the New Deal has followed. Why the farmers could have consented to its continuance and do not realize what is being done to them, why they tolerate it, is beyond me. They have the solution in their hands if they would wake up to realize that fact, and the remedy, like charity, begins at home.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Well, they are not going to play him for a sucker if I can prevent it. If the membership of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, had time to look into this parity question, I am thoroughly convinced that there would not be a baker's dozen vote against the provisions written into the bill, and justly written into it, by Mr. TARVER's committee. I just want the farmer to get a fair deal. I am not willing to have the sword of Damocles placed in the hands of Mr. Henderson, when it comes to the farmer. Place that power in his hands, and let him be the sole arbiter, as he seems to be, and it would take an act of Divine Providence to save the farmers of America.

I know the membership of this House wants to give the American farmers a square deal. That is all we are asking.

We are not asking for any favors. We are only asking that this House redeem the pledge made the American farmers for the past 10 years and give them a parity price.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Who gave Mr. Henderson all this power?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not know who gave him the power, but here is one Representative who is willing to take it away from him if he ever attempts to use it to the detriment of the American farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a few minutes to clarify what appears to be a misunderstanding with reference to soil-conservation payments, or if I am wrong in my conception, I would like to be corrected and put right.

Some people have the idea that soil-conservation payments are gratuities to farmers. I think it will be conceded by practically everybody in this country that agriculture is the basis of our national wealth. I think it will be conceded, further, that soil fertility is the basis of a successful agriculture. Now, if you agree with me in these two premises, let us take the testimony of our soil experts. They tell us that 300 years ago, or even 200 years ago, in this country we had approximately 9 inches of soil throughout the length and breadth of the United States. That was the average depth of the soil—soil in which you could plant seed and expect returns. That soil is national wealth. Since the establishment of our experiment stations and other research agencies in the Department of Agriculture those in charge have found and said to us that on account of erosion there has been depletion of this soil to the extent of 4 inches. Therefore we have lost nearly one-half of our national wealth from the standpoint of soil, and it is estimated that in another 200 years, at the same rate of soil depletion, with a normal increase in population, the soil of this country would not have a sufficient amount of plant food to feed our people. We insist, therefore, it is a problem for the Nation, a problem for the Government to conserve the soil, conserve the plant food, conserve this element of national wealth, and the plan adopted a few years ago following the farm-production program was that if a farmer would adjust his farming operations to the program outlined by our Department of Agriculture the Government of the United States would pay him for his labor and efforts. This program, of course, contemplated restoration of the soil or a further prevention of erosion, further loss of the national wealth. The plan was adopted to insure the future security of our people.

You say, "Well, the farmer gets the benefit of it." Possibly he does, to a limited extent, but the farmer himself is not charged with the responsibility of effecting ways and means and plans for taking care of the population 200 years from

now. The people in industry, the people in workshops, people in the various professions 200 years from now, under the policy that we have followed for the last two centuries, would be unable to find a supply of foodstuffs without having to import them, and no one knows where they would get them from. Therefore, the Government, feeling its responsibility, has said to the farmers of the country, "If you will cooperate by adjusting your farm operation in such a way as to retain the soil, prevent further depletion, and increase soil fertility, we will pay you a certain amount for your effort." That is what I understand as soil-conservation benefits.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to ask the gentleman two or three questions. Is it not sometimes claimed by the opposition that the farmer is paid for not producing crops, thereby giving the wrong impression?

Mr. HARE. That is correct. That is the reason I stated at the outset that I wanted to clarify some misunderstandings on the part of some people, if I could, and if I were wrong I wanted to have my impressions clarified.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not true that this country could be turned into a Sahara Desert, not only through defeat by such powers as the Axis, but also by a continuation of the very process that has been going on here for 200 years?

Mr. HARE. If I am to believe the integrity and ability of soil experts, of those familiar with these subjects, that within two centuries—and that is only a span in the life of a nation—within two centuries the productivity of the soil of this country, if depletion should continue at the rate it has for the last 200 years, then we may have almost a desert—that is, you would have land that would be non-productive. You would have land from which the people could expect little or nothing. It would not even support the man who tilled it, much less get a surplus with which to support the people in industry, in workshops, and in various types of occupation throughout the country.

Therefore, at the expense of repetition, let me say that the soil-conservation program is to pay the farmer for the contribution he is making at the expense of sweat and elbow grease to preserve the national wealth of our country in order that it may be available in the centuries to come.

Mr. MURDOCK. In other words, we should establish a soil, as well as a Constitution, "for ourselves and our posterity."

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman said that hundreds of years ago land was considered the basis of wealth. Is it not true today also?

Mr. HARE. I make that my basic premise, that agriculture is the basis of our national wealth and that soil fertility is the basis of successful agriculture. If I am correct in this, then it is a

national problem to see that the fertility of the soil throughout the Nation is preserved; and if the problem is to be solved it has been decided by those assigned to its solution that it can best be done by paying the farmer for cooperating with his government in its soil-conservation program. The farmer who preserves his soil not only discharges a patriotic duty to his government but contributes to the future wealth of his nation and the support and happiness of unborn generations; and the small payment he gets now is not a gratuity, it is a payment for services.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time for the express purpose of calling to the attention of the House a telegram I received this morning from the secretary of the Colorado Mining Association which just bears out the statement made on the floor a while ago that when we turn all this power over to bureaus, boards, and commissions, we have no way of keeping track of what they are doing, this is the situation that develops:

DENVER, COLO., March 3, 1942.

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL,

House Office Building:

Amendment to priority orders P-56 and P-56-A issued today by Metals Division, War Production Board, excluding all metal mines producing more than 30 percent in dollar value of gold and/or silver will close down virtually all mines in Colorado. Entire districts whose economy is based on mining, including the general economy of the State of Colorado, will be vitally affected. The seriousness of this order cannot be overemphasized, and we appeal to you to use every effort to have the order rescinded. By reason of the gold and silver values in our ores we have been able to produce approximately 22,000,000 pounds of copper, lead, and zinc annually. The production of these vital war metals will be cut off if this order stands, as all of Colorado mines, with few exceptions, rely on their gold and silver values to keep in operation. The order affects Colorado more drastically than any other State and is a State-wide tragedy. A delegation will come to Washington next week to help you in your efforts.

ROBERT S. PALMER,

Secretary, Colorado Mining Association.

I just mention this because these boys are going to be compelled to shut down every mine in Colorado.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For stationery, supplies, materials, and equipment, freight, express, and drayage charges, advertising, communication service, postage, washing towels, repairs, and alterations; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motorcycle and not to exceed three motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (including one for the Secretary of Agriculture, one for general utility needs of the entire Department, and one for the Forest Service) and purchase of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle at not to exceed \$1,500, including the exchange value of one such vehicle, for official purposes only; for

official travel expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field for any bureau, office, or service of the Department; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, which are authorized by such officer as the Secretary may designate, \$98,341, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1943 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of \$131,605, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1943 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1943, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries of employees engaged in the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-transport vehicles, and that this appropriation shall be reimbursed from the appropriation made for any bureau or office for which such service is performed, in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 11, 1922 (5 U. S. C. 543): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, during the fiscal year for which this appropriation is made, may maintain stocks of stationery, supplies, equipment, and miscellaneous materials sufficient to meet, in whole or in part, requirements of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of Washington and elsewhere, but not to exceed in the aggregate \$200,000 in value at the close of the fiscal year, and the appropriations of such bureaus, offices, and agencies available for the purchase of stationery, supplies, equipment, and miscellaneous materials shall be available to reimburse the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses current at the time supplies are allotted, assigned, or issued, or when payment is received; for transfer for the purchase of inventory; and for transfer pursuant to the provisions of section 601 of the act approved June 30, 1932 (31 U. S. C. 686): *Provided further*, That the appropriations made hereunder shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses for purchasing, storing, handling, packing, or shipping supplies and blank forms, and there shall be charged proportionately as a part of the cost of supplies issued an amount to cover such salaries and expenses, and in the case of blank forms and supplies not purchased from this appropriation an amount to cover such salaries and expenses shall be charged proportionately to the proper appropriation: *Provided further*, That the facilities of the central storehouse of the Department shall to the fullest extent practicable be used to make unnecessary the maintenance of separate bureau storehouse activities in the Department: *Provided further*, That a separate schedule of expenditures, transfers of funds, or other transactions hereunder shall be included in the annual Budget: *Provided further*, That, except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 5, line 11, strike out "\$98,341" and insert "\$33,841."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take the time of the House to explain what I am going to attempt to do in regard to this agricultural bill. I, like many hundreds of Members of the House, have felt rather a sense of futility in remaining in the House and passing without reduction appropriation bills as they come before us. We know that these bills are carefully weighed by efficient committees of the House, that they go into these matters at great length, they hear the testimony from the departments, they have the evidence that has been gathered by the Budget Bureau, but these bills deal in millions and oftentimes billions.

We watch them go through and we sometimes wish we could do something about the waste that each and every one of us realizes is going on.

During the black-out last night I took the opportunity to go through this generous-sized book issued by the Bureau of the Budget and came to a startling realization by following out a little hobby I have of analyzing one particular element of an expense bill.

From that analysis I found that the Department of Agriculture bill as reported today and as reported by the Budget contains practically \$16,000,000 for travel expenses. Sixteen million dollars for travel expenses. I analyzed it carefully last night and today checked with the Budget Bureau to be certain that I was not duplicating any items from transferred funds. I found, for instance, such items as Soil Conservation Service spending \$1,003,000 for travel. It seems like our topsoil is not the only thing that is moving.

Further, I find that the A. A. A., under the Soil and Domestic Allotment Act, is going to spend \$1,491,000 for travel expense for the coming year.

Now, I could go on at length with these items. I have about 30 amendments to offer. I hate to take the time of the committee with these amendments but to reduce as much of the \$16,000,000 as possible requires it. This present one you are invited to vote on now provides for a reduction of \$65,500 from the amount recommended by the committee of \$98,341 provided for miscellaneous expenditures in the office of the Secretary. The office of the Secretary miscellaneous expenditures is budgeted for travel expenses for \$131,000 for the coming year. We divide the \$131,000 for travel expense in half and arrive at the figure \$65,500 that I am seeking to reduce this particular item of the appropriation bill.

We all know that the charge of pica-yunish may be hurled at such an effort to strike from this gigantic appropriation bill only such small sums as twenty or thirty thousand dollars, but I call your attention to the fact that throughout this great, broad land of ours today, the money that is going to see Uncle Sam through this most dangerous time in the history of our Union is coming in in dribbles of 10 and 25 cents from the children, workers, and farmers.

This reduction and others that I seek will not hurt the agricultural appropriation bill one iota. It merely expects Government employees and bureau office-holders to come down to a realization of the fight and danger we are in. We cannot tolerate waste and go to our people with the tax bill that we must go to them with on March 15 of this year, and then double that figure next year without making every possible effort to cut non-defense items all along the line.

It may be contended that these amounts are vital for travel, but I propose to allow one-half of the amount that is budgeted for travel. They can travel half as much, they may go half as far, send one-half as many workers on trips or if they have to do it they might even ride the day coaches to Washington for some of these conferences. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We should also bear in mind that train rates and passenger rates have been increased very materially just recently and that the new tax bill carries a 15-percent increase in straight passenger fares and a 20-percent increase in Pullman and chair-car rates.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman knows that Government employees on official duty do not pay that tax.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They may not pay the tax, but they ride the airplanes and push up the rate considerably.

Mr. MONRONEY. They get a 15-percent reduction on the airplanes. I think this is a good amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will support the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it should be necessary for the committee to take time in opposition to all these thirty-odd amendments that the gentleman from Oklahoma says it is his purpose to offer in the course of the consideration of this bill if in every instance, as in this instance, he has no reason whatever based upon facts which ought to have consideration for the reduction which he proposes. Economy is a very desirable thing. Our subcommittee thought so, too, and for this reason it has recommended cuts in the amounts in this bill, including direct appropriations, reappropriations, and loans aggregating \$560,000,000, below the current year.

No one can charge that the subcommittee in the preparation of this bill has been inclined toward extravagance. The gentleman by this amendment proposes, if I understood it correctly, a reduction of about \$65,000 in the \$98,000 item, without reason, except the gentleman's desire for economy and his fear that the school children of America in 10- and 15-cent contributions are going to make up the amount of these expenditures.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The appropriation which the gentleman has mentioned as being listed in the Budget on page 303 of grand-total obligations includes transfers under the bookkeeping system of the Department of Agriculture totaling \$1,029,946.

Mr. TARVER. I hope the gentleman is not laboring under the impression that when he desires to decrease some other item in the appropriation bill he may do it by cutting off an amount of one particular item which has no relationship to the other items which he thinks ought to be decreased. The gentleman is proposing to decrease the \$98,000 item here to \$33,000. Does the gentleman know of any reason other than his very earnest desire for economy why the amount of \$98,341 should be decreased? If so, I yield to him for an explanation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Because you have in the fund against which this Department charges the sum total of \$1,029,000. I seek to decrease it by only a small amount, only one-half of the money that our public officials are planning to spend on travel for the coming year.

Mr. TARVER. I presume the gentleman's other 30 amendments propose to decrease by half the money that is proposed for expenditure, which, of course, is a very wise method of writing an appropriation bill. The thing to do, according to the gentleman's idea, is to have the Budget submit estimates, have the committee reduce the estimates, as in this bill, \$2,000,000 below what the Budget has recommended, and then cut what is left in half. The gentleman has the idea that the result will be a proper provision for the Department of Agriculture. I think that idea is so unsound as not to require further discussion. I hope the amendment and all the other amendments of the gentleman, unless they have a sounder foundation, may be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 22, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, \$210,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the fiscal year 1943 for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of \$1,937,749, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed the total amount set up in the Budget schedules for such purpose under this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the fiscal year 1943 shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for 1943, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to

this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 7, line 25, after "service", strike out "\$210,000" and insert "\$184,275."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the distinguished chairman of the committee does not see fit to think that in this time it is important that we pick out every possible item that can be saved to gird America for the tremendous battle we are in.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman give us any reason why the chairman of the subcommittee should ask him to give detailed reasons why his amendment should be adopted, and then not give any detailed reasons why it should be rejected?

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman very much. I do think it is a little bit unusual that a Member questioning an appropriation should be made to give the reasons for doing so. In my experience in legislation, it has always seemed that the man who was trying to get the money out of the taxpayers' hide was the man who had to furnish the preponderance of the proof that the expenditure was justified.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. I have not studied the bill as diligently as he has studied it, nor the Budget estimates, but I would be surprised if the gentleman from Oklahoma took as unsound a position as the gentleman from Georgia, for whom I also have a high regard, has indicated. I have observed that the gentleman from Oklahoma exercises care in taking a position and that he has a remarkable record of sound positions. I understood him to say there was \$16,000,000 for travel expenses in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is it the gentleman's purpose to try to reduce that appropriation?

Mr. MONRONEY. My purpose is to try to reduce that by about one-half and save the taxpayers of this country approximately \$8,000,000, that will never be missed by the farmers of this country one bit. It will only inconvenience and disturb some bureaucrat downtown and perhaps force him to ride in an upper berth or in a chair car or come to these Washington or district conferences just half as often. I cannot see how any man can defend paying out money for such a purpose in an hour like this.

Mr. GORE. I think we ought to cut out a lot of travel expense.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his contribution.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe the farmers of the United States would miss anything if you cut out all those travel expenses?

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot see how they could.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course not.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If the amendment to cut out the Farm Security Administration appropriation should be adopted, has the gentleman any idea how much smaller an appropriation would be required for legal fees under this provision?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am working now merely on the travel accounts. This paragraph of the lawyers totals in the Budget for travel for the coming year \$51,450. There must be some reason why the Budget itemizes this account. Perhaps I do not understand the gentleman from Georgia. Perhaps that is all superfluous language in the Budget. However, they have carefully under the 0-6 account in connection with every one of these departments listed the total amount they are setting up for expenditure for travel.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, if the gentleman is seriously insisting on his amendment, and it appears that several of our colleagues think it ought to be seriously considered, I believe he ought to be in a position to tell us why he has adopted the particular figure he has suggested in his amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be happy to tell the gentleman, but I would first like to call his attention to the fact that I can find no evidence that his great committee inquired into the cost or the total or the amount to justify the travel account or why it was fixed at these figures in reaching these travel appropriations.

Mr. TARVER. I am not sure that I understand the gentleman. Does he mean that he has read the hearings before the subcommittee and has been unable to get information on that subject?

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman knows it is impossible to read completely through the hearings in one evening, but I have been unable to find in my reading of the hearings any extended or important testimony taken by the members of the committee to determine how many dollars were required by what officers for travel to carry on the work of the Department of Agriculture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

There is included in this item which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] seeks so drastically to reduce \$51,450 for travel, which is a reduction by the Budget, whose recommendation in

the matter was approved by the subcommittee, in the amount of \$20,000, approximately, a very considerable reduction.

The gentleman, in offering his first amendment awhile ago, undertook to say, and, of course, his statement is appreciated—

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. No; I will not yield to the gentleman at this time.

That the subcommittee had entered into a consideration of all these items in great detail, which it has. The subcommittee has been engaged in its work since the 19th of November 1941. It has taken, including the copper hearings, over 2,000 pages of evidence. I do not say that I remember now every item of testimony regarding every one of these subdivisions of expense in the various bureaus and divisions of the Department. I do not. Perhaps there are some men on the subcommittee who might be capable of doing it. But I do know that we have given careful consideration to every item, adduced evidence with reference to them, and have effected reductions, where we could without, in our opinion, injuring the work of the Department. Those reductions have, as I have already indicated in the matter of direct appropriations, run approximately \$2,000,000 below the Budget figures which have very drastically reduced the amount of the appropriation for the Department for the next year. I do not think there is any basis upon which, under these circumstances, the committee could arbitrarily say that you ought to cut in half the amount which had been allowed in the subcommittee's bill for the Solicitor's Office for travel expense after the amount had already been reduced by the Budget by \$20,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I ask the distinguished chairman if this amount of some fifty thousand dollars was put into the Budget prior to Pearl Harbor or after Pearl Harbor, and does the gentleman think that has any importance in the consideration of this appropriation?

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman is not any more interested than I or more interested than any member of our committee in the matter of effecting every possible economy. We knew of our national danger before Pearl Harbor. There were some of us who were trying to effect such economies as were possible before Pearl Harbor. May I say to the gentleman that, perhaps, I have voted against more appropriations in recent years than any Member of the House with one or two possible exceptions. I have voted against over \$14,000,000,000 of appropriations that have been made during this administration. I do not yield to him or anyone else in the matter of bringing about reasonable economy, but I do not think it is fair even to consider taking a broadax and whacking off half of an appropriation which is recommended by a subcommittee which has given careful consideration to all

of the facts in relation to that and other appropriations in the bill. If you think so, all right. I think you are going to injure seriously the Department of Agriculture if you do it.

I think the gentleman is a very able man, but I would think he certainly should not be insisting on making this drastic reduction of one-half of an item without advancing any reason upon which to base that action and expect that the House will do it. I certainly hope that it may not be seriously considered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while this amount is spoken of as being a great sum, yet the sum total is \$210,000, and my mission in taking the floor is to speak about an item that I believe probably most of the Members of the House may have some idea about and will realize what the appropriation of such an amount will mean. When we get down to talking about \$100,000 or \$50,000 or \$25,000, I can understand that, and I believe that a majority of the Members can understand it, but when the chairman of the committee, the genial gentleman from Georgia, and one of the fine men here, states that he voted against \$14,000,000,000 of appropriations, why, gracious goodness, that is not very much.

He voted against \$14,000,000,000. Mr. Chairman, we have appropriated over \$116,000,000,000 since the 22d of January, and that does not take into consideration the enormous appropriations made last year, the most extravagant appropriations ever made up until January of this year. When the gentleman submitted this amendment cutting down the item of salaries, certainly one can realize that we have had too much running around in government. There is too much in this bill that never should have been legislated—too much money here that should never be appropriated. A number of items in this bill will have amendments offered to cut them down. The people of the country have the idea that we are cutting down the regular appropriations of government. Last year you told them that, and you told it to them the year before, and they think we are going to do it. I do not think we are going to cut them down because too many different branches of the Government want to be perpetuated, and there is no better evidence of that than in this sugar quota we have in this bill, \$48,000,000. Last year we paid the sugar growers of this country millions and millions of dollars not to raise sugar. We have in this bill \$48,000,000 for the sugar raisers, to raise sugar. The subcommittee says it should not be appropriated, and yet we put it in the bill. There is somebody in high authority in this Government that says that we ought to do it, to maintain this force of Government workers on the pay roll. They have to pay the farmer now for raising sugar, when a year ago we paid them for not raising sugar. What is the matter with this Congress?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman says that somebody in high authority brought it about. Is it not true that last December both Democrats and Republicans of the House passed the authorization bill which is the basis for this appropriation?

Mr. RICH. The fact of the matter is that last year you had 250 tons of sugar over here in Puerto Rico that the Agricultural Department refused to let the farmers touch. They refused to let them harvest that sugar, and you bring in a bill now that tries to raise more sugar, and you are going to pay the farmers what you did last year. If the farmers want such a bill, you ought to stop it, and the best way to do it is to stop appropriations. I am not opposed to Congress doing things like that, I say to my friend from Texas, and I hope the gentleman will join me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words. The item under discussion involves a small one for travel. There are 202 lawyers in the Solicitor's office and all of them I dare say do a certain amount of traveling. The amount is meager for each lawyer and remember it includes subsistence and other expenses in addition to the actual railroad fare, automobile, and other means of transportation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Not now. I do not think the amount is unusual for a lawyer to spend in the transaction of business. Every lawyer in the United States spends more than that amount sought every year for travel expenses. To show you the good faith of the department and the committee in cutting this appropriation bill, the item of travel expense has been reduced by \$20,000. In other words, we realized the necessity for economy. For these reasons I hope the House will ratify the action of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and the Chair, being in doubt the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 48, noes 37.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote upon the ground that it discloses the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and six Members present, a quorum.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. As many as are in favor ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONRONEY) there were—ayes 72, noes 37.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill

H. R. 6709, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may include in the remarks he made today some newspaper articles and one editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any other special orders which may have been heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

ACQUISITION OF FRENCH POSSESSIONS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during World War No. 1 we acquired the Virgin Islands and paid \$25,000,000 for them. They have given us a few headaches but at least they are bases for us today and not potential bases for an enemy unless he captures them.

Today there is widespread uneasiness over what Vichy France may do with her fleet. If it goes into operation on the side of the Axis Powers, every island owned by France in this hemisphere becomes a potential base for enemy operations, a certain base for enemy activity, I should say. Newspaper editorials and special articles over the week end were prolific on this subject.

France is hungry. France needs food and gold. Whether it is more dangerous for her to have food and gold than possession of bases on both sides of the Panama Canal I do not know. I feel it not inappropriate, however, again to call attention of the Foreign Affairs Committee to a bill, H. R. 4781, which I introduced last May which would direct the Secretary of State to institute negotiations with the Government of France looking toward the acquisition by the United States of the French possessions in the Western Hemisphere, particularly the Islands of Martinique, Guadeloupe, St. Pierre, and Miquelon in the Atlantic Ocean; Clipperton and the islands of French Oceania in the Pacific Ocean; and the Province of French Guiana in South America, together with such ships, airplanes, and cargoes as the French Government may care to sell, and to pay therefor with gold, food, commodities, and credits as herein provided.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article written by one of the classmates of Ensign Craig Spowers, my candidate to Annapolis in 1937, who graduated with the class of 1941 with distinction, and who died in

the defense of his country on the *Reuben James* when she was torpedoed on the night of October 30-31, 1941. Craig Spowers was the first casualty of the class of 1941. He was an outstanding example of American manhood and typifies all that is best in courage and patriotism. My heartfelt sympathy has been and is again expressed to his family in their great sorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SANDERS was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie M. Maye; and

H. R. 3966. An act for the relief of Estella King.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie M. Maye;

H. R. 3966. An act for the relief of Estella King;

H. R. 4401. An act to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, Glenn Dale, Md.;

H. R. 6291. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the coordination of the forwarding and similar servicing of water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States;

H. R. 6375. An act to amend subchapter 2 of chapter 19 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6446. An act to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof; the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service; and civilian employees of the executive departments, independent establishments, and agencies during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6550. An act to extend and amend subtitle "Insurance" of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public, No. 677, 76th Cong.), approved June 29, 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6611. An act making additional appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcar and vehicular traffic.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 5, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

POSTPONEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H. R. 6503

This will advise you that the hearings previously scheduled for Tuesday, February 17, 1942, at 10 a. m., have been postponed until Thursday, March 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 6503, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will continue its hearings on H. R. 6522 on Thursday, March 5, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., in room 353, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, March 11, 1942, at 10 a. m. subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on H. R. 6444, to provide for the registration of labor organizations, business, and trade associations, and so forth. The hearing will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1451. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1452. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and a proposed provision pertaining to the estimate of appropriation for the same office for 1943, submitted in the form of an amendment to the 1943 Budget (H. Doc. No. 642); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1453. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for flood control, in the amount of \$2,210,000, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 643); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1853. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive

Papers. House Report No. 1854. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5059. A bill to grant the status of quota immigrants to Mr. William B. Fawcner and his wife Mrs. Ida Fawcner; with amendment (Rept. No. 1852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 6723. A bill for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund, State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6724. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 6725. A bill to extend to April 15 the time for filing certain income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6727. A bill to lower the rate of tax imposed with respect to the transfer of certain small guns; and to lower the rate of tax imposed upon manufacturers and dealers in such guns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MACIORA introduced a bill (H. R. 6726) to provide for the establishment of a commissary or vending stand in the Washington asylum and jail, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2516. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the executive council of the Beaver County (Pa.) Sabbath School Association, an accredited auxiliary of the Pennsylvania State Sabbath School Association, urging the prohibition of the manufacture, transportation, and sale of distilled malt and vinous liquors for beverage purposes until victory is achieved and the armed forces of the Nation demobilized, the date of such demobilization to be fixed by Presidential proclamation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2517. Also, petition of 80 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Senate bill 860, which is designed to keep liquor from the military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2518. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Los Angeles Smelter and Brass Workers Union, Local 468, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to marketing quota of burley and dark-fired tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1942

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast made all things for Thy glory and hast created man in Thine own image: Help us to discern with ever-increasing gratitude the wondrous gifts Thou dost impart through speech and thought, which, swift as wind with tempered mood for higher life, prepares us for whatever chance the coming days may bring.

Do Thou bless and prosper every sacrifice we make in the service of our country, and crown it with the type of spiritual joy that shall countervail all sorrow and separation and become our permanent possession.

Remove from our midst the shallow spirit of cynicism which thinks it more clever to criticize than to cooperate; and do Thou increase in us day by day the spirit of loyalty and devotion to our national ideals, to our President, and all who share his burden of responsibility and leadership. And as we dedicate our all to Thee, in selfless, loving service, may every man of us respond unto this challenging appeal:

"Thou hast thy way to go, thou hast thy day

To live: Thou hast thy need of thee to make

In the hearts of others: Do thy thing: Yes, slake

The world's great thirst for yet another Man!

And be thou sure of this: No other can Do for thee that appointed thee of God."

In our Saviour's Name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 2, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 2d instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received during adjournment of the Senate:

That the House had passed the bill (S. 2198) to provide for the financing of the War Damage Corporation, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

That the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3761. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie M. Maye;

H. R. 3966. An act for the relief of Estella King; and

H. R. 4401. An act to provide for the establishment of a commissary or canteen at Glenn Dale Sanatorium, Glenn Dale, Md.

That the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 6291. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the coordination of the forwarding and similar servicing of water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States;

H. R. 6375. An act to amend subchapter 2 of chapter 19 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6611. An act making appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Public Utilities Commission to make an investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of the construction of subways in the District of Columbia for both streetcars and vehicular traffic.

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5784) to consolidate the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas, and Mr. DIRKSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had severally disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House, asked conferences with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conferences:

H. R. 4557. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook;

H. R. 4665. An act for the relief of Harry Kahn; and

H. R. 5290. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eddie A. Schneider.

That the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5473) for the relief of Allene Ruhlman and John P. Ruhlman; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6543) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the production of alcohol, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1782. An act to authorize the payment of a donation to and to provide for the